THEOLOGY

VOL. LXII OCTOBER, 1959 No. 472

Editorial

THE practice of reading a brief introduction to the Lessons on Sundays is spreading and it is to be commended. Both the Bishop of Rochester and the Bishop of Knaresborough, who have published such introductions before, have now produced a complete series for use with the 1955 lectionary. The Bishop of Rochester's is entitled *The Meaning of the Lessons* (S.P.C.K., 15s. 6d.), and the Bishop of Knaresborough's *Headings for the Lessons* (Mowbray, 6s.), and the difference of title indicates the difference between them. The Bishop of Knaresborough usually supplies only a single sentence or phrase which declares what the Lesson is about or what its point is. Dr Chavasse, on the other hand, supplies a paragraph of four or five sentences in which he seeks to answer three questions: Why is this particular Lesson read on this Sunday or Holy Day? What is its context and general meaning? And what is its central message? We incline to think that, if Lessons are to be introduced, the slightly fuller introduction is to be preferred. It goes without saying that there is nothing to prevent any of us from trying our hand at improving the wording of any of the suggested introductions. *The Meaning of the Lessons* is bound in cloth and provided with an index.

* * * * *

Dr C. W. Dugmore's inaugural lecture as Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of London has been published under the title *Ecclesiastical History No Soft Option* (S.P.C.K., 5s. 6d.). It supplies a concise survey of the study of church history from the earliest days, and shows how in the modern period its standards have been raised and its resources increased. The lecture will be read with advantage by any who are embarking on a study of the subject or who are contemplating the selection of a field for research.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. " 'The Parson's Home', a Poem. (Rivingtons.) In style a not altogether unsuccessful imitation of the more familiar manner of Cowper, with a tinge of Crabbe. It seems to have been executed as a kind of prolusion, or agreeable metrical exercise, by 'an English Vicar' on whose hands we conceive time to have hung somewhat heavily. The Parson sketched is from life; and there are touches in it which prove it to be life-like. It pictures a large-limbed, scholarly North-country 'rector'—a Magistrate, and Chairman of Quarter Sessions—affable, homely, hospitable; a bachelor, with a good bottle of port and a pretty niece—apparently without a priestly idea, but an extremely active citizen and neighbour. . . . Subjoined are a few fugitive, and very worthless, pieces by the

'Rector' himself: they are of that mediocre cast which respectable clergymen of the last century, with a reputation for politeness and literature to keep up, used to write. They are generally addressed to ladies: and read like the *persiflage* of a respectable French Abbé. For credit's sake two or three have a religious aspect: but they do not range beyond versifying a collect, or diluting a passage of Scripture into common-place verse."—*The Christian Remembrancer*, October 1849, p. 480.

Episcopacy and Intercommunion

THE slap in the face of the Church of England recently administered by the Kirk has its sad as well as its salutary aspect. It is a grim prospect for those who care deeply about the ecumenical movement that any effective steps towards closer union have probably been put off for a generation. It is sad, if only because the passions aroused by the so-called "Bishops' Report"—itself a real achievement in ecumenical theology—have had so little to do with theology. But I believe it will also turn out to be salutary. So rude a jolt may well have been necessary in order to make us think again. And this may soon become imperative. For we have full-scale negotiations with the Methodists on our hands, and it would be tragic if they went the same way. And there is a real possibility that they might, since we are here playing on much the same wicket, which could easily turn out to be the same sticky dog.

A reappraisal may indeed be being forced upon us of the whole present round of reunion discussions. This goes back now some thirteen years, to the Cambridge University sermon preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury on 3 November 1946, which he entitled "A Step Forward in Church Relations". No sermon delivered since the war has probably had such far-reaching consequences, and few can doubt that it has marked "a step forward". It has released a new impetus and provided a limited objective which has made constructive discussion possible. Its essential proposal was that we should take two bites at the cherry of reunion, aiming first not at complete constitutional union but at full intercommunion, this latter to be achieved by the non-episcopal Churches' "taking episcopacy into their systems".

I believe it has done nothing but good to give this imaginative proposal the testing it deserved. For it is only by taking it as far as it can go that the dangers in it have begun to be apparent. But having now sighted them, I believe that we should be prepared to draw up sharply, before we become involved in another crash, which, because it is nearer home, could set things back even more disastrously.

Since the immediate danger is focused in the conversations between the Church of England and the Methodists, it will be best to concentrate on these rather than rake over the Presbyterian wreck.

The immediate aim of these conversations, as the Interim Report[1] makes clear, is not the union of our two Churches but the achievement of intercommunion between them. To this end—which it is stressed is only a half-way house—the Report explores the ways in which the Methodists might become an episcopal Church. While everyone agrees that "nothing short of organic unity . . . should be the final goal", it is open to serious question whether this is in fact the best first step towards it.

To explore means of unifying episcopal and non-episcopal ministries so that we may become one Church is something to which we should be prepared to give, and to sacrifice, a very great deal. To go through this exercise in order that we may for the foreseeable future have parallel and competing episcopal denominations would appear to get us very little further. It means, it is true, that we should be able to communicate and to celebrate at each others' tables. But this, if we still have no real desire for *union*, may be just as sinful as to refrain from so doing. "If there is a real passion for unity", wrote Bishop Lesslie Newbigin in an earlier number of this journal,[2] "and a willingness to pay the cost of it, intercommunion is the proper relationship of the Churches as they move forward to the fulfilment of their unity. But experience surely shows that intercommunion apart from any such passion merely slackens the tension of desire, and weakens the sense of seriousness of what is involved in sharing together in the Lord's Supper. If, in one street, we have episcopal church No. 1 (Anglican), episcopal church No. 2 (Presbyterian), and episcopal church No. 3 (Methodist), each under a different bishop, related to a quite separate church organization, it is hard to see that the scandal of division has in any way been lessened in that street, even though the members are free to drop in at each other's communions." Full communion without union with a distant Church, as in South India, or even in Scotland, may be a highly desirable step—so that when a member or a minister moves from one to the other there is no break. But for disunited and competing Churches *in the same parish* to claim to be in full communion with each other is to invite the world, not to believe in our unity, but to question our integrity.[3]

Moreover, to use the historic episcopate to compass this end is in danger of evacuating it of the very meaning for which I as an Anglican cherish it and would yearn for Methodists to share it. Either the local bishop is, as Ignatius insisted, the centre and focus in any given place of the one catholic Church, or he is nothing worth contending for. That in one town there should be two—or three or

[1] *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church: An Interim Statement.* 1958. (Reviewed, editorially, in THEOLOGY, September 1958.)

[2] "Anglicans and Christian Reunion", THEOLOGY, June 1958, p. 225.

[3] A comparable situation has arisen with the Old Catholics in Holland, where in some places the Church of England is ministering not only to its own expatriates but to natives of the country. The Old Catholics have rightly questioned what the agreement on full communion in these circumstances really means.

four—local bishops each claiming, and acknowledged by the others, to represent *the* historic episcopate seems if anything worse than having one whom half the Christians in the place do not recognize. Let us go all out to achieve a single ministry which is truly catholic and which all acknowledge. Let us beware, as a supposed half-way house to that, of multiplying episcopates. If the bishop is the focus of the catholic Church in any one place, then there cannot be two bishops any more than two catholic Churches. The proposal we are asked to consider is in danger of countenancing precisely the situation which everyone deplores in the Nandyal area of South India, where because of failure to unite there have had temporarily to be parallel episcopates, of the Church of South India and of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, Churches which are themselves in communion with each other. Of course, the motives in the two cases are very different: in England such parallel episcopates would be the result of co-operation rather than of schism. Moreover, the Report envisages that this parallelism would exist within a real measure of unity. But when we ask what this unity means, the gathering in general and local assembly of which it speaks amounts to no more than a closely knit council of Churches. There certainly would not be one bishop in one place.

I am not convinced, as I said, that this is a very profitable pursuit upon which to bend our energies. The Free Churches themselves have long enjoyed such a degree of intimacy without being driven any nearer to organic union. But this does not in itself make it a dangerous pursuit. What makes it dangerous, as the crash in Scotland has shown, is that this very order of procedure forces us into the position of commending episcopacy on the wrong grounds. We find ourselves having to argue it, not as the basis of unity, but as the condition of intercommunion.

Few responsible Christian leaders to-day would dispute that in some form the historic episcopate is the only practicable basis—to put it no higher—for the reunion of Christendom. That the possession or acquisition of episcopacy is the condition of intercommunion is, I believe, much more questionable Anglican teaching, both historically and theologically. The Lambeth Quadrilateral (of Bible, Creeds, Sacraments and Bishops) was formulated as a basis of unity, an attempted expression of the fulness of the Church: it has come in these latter years to be used as a precondition of intercommunion, a minimum qualification of catholicity.[1]

Along this line one soon gets to the position, not that if the Church is to be one it must be episcopal, but that if a Church is to be a Church at all it must have bishops. Episcopacy comes to be commended not as the source and symbol of unity but as a gimmick for validating sacraments—and this is what neither Presbyterians nor

[1] In a comparable way, the rubric requiring Confirmation as the normal prerequisite of Communion has been turned from being a domestic discipline of the Church of England into a fence against Nonconformists. It is reassuring, at any rate, that the Report refuses to envisage episcopal confirmation as a necessary condition of intercommunion.

Methodists nor any other non-episcopal Church will stand *or ought to stand*. As long as we make jumping the episcopal hurdle the condition of intercommunion rather than the basis of union, we are inevitably committed to commending it on false grounds. And it is not surprising that the hurdle is kicked over.

Moreover, as long as the Church of England shelters behind this hurdle, we shall never be forced to ask ourselves what is the *true* condition of intercommunion. It is worth trying to define what this is, since we have relieved ourselves of the necessity of doing so by taking cover behind the legal obstacle of episcopal orders. Indeed, one of the disconcerting features of the Report is that it concentrates entirely on removing this obstacle, on the assumption apparently that when intercommunion is lawful it is automatically expedient.

The condition of intercommunion, most simply stated, is that a situation is reached in which it becomes more sinful *not* to break a common loaf than to do so. To do so when the one loaf corresponds with no spiritual reality is indeed to invoke judgment upon ourselves, by receiving the very thing our lives deny, the Body of Christ, the one new man in Christ Jesus. And, let us be frank, this is still the situation in the majority of parishes in England to-day, where the congregations of the different denominations are perfectly content to go on in their separated ways. Indiscriminate intercommunion in these circumstances would be sin, *and would continue to be so even if the other denomination were episcopal*. But where the spiritual reality does exist, then to refuse a common loaf is to be guilty of acting an equal lie. This the Church of England has long recognized in its permission for opening Communion to non-Anglicans in a college chapel,[1] where its members meet at one table for everything else and are to all intents and purposes a single spiritual community.

Such is the condition of intercommunion. It may be negated by a number of things, including a deep division on Church order. But it is essentially a spiritual condition, and it will vary widely in local situations. To require an episcopally ordained ministry as the *sine qua non* of any intercommunion is not only to allow the ministry an absolute veto over all the rest of the Church's life to which it has no theological right; it is to impose a strait jacket which prevents advance at any point on the front till all have achieved it. Since ministries can be unified only at the level of denominations as a whole, nothing can be done from the bottom till something is done at the top. Already there are situations in which this is producing

[1] This freedom was regularized by the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York in January 1933, but it was not created then. In composite resolutions of both Convocations, defining the conditions and occasions of limited intercommunion at Anglican altars, the clause relating to school and college chapels provoked no controversy. In fact, the sole reference to it in the speeches was in Archbishop Lang's summing up in the Convocation of Canterbury, when he made it clear that this clause was simply giving official recognition to long-established practice.

fearful frustration. Indeed, I could not have answered for the spiritual state of the college chapel of which till recently I have been Dean, had we not had the privilege of which I have spoken.

But even this privilege extends only to the sharing by members of other Churches in an Anglican celebration. In an Anglican foundation, such as an Oxford or Cambridge college, where there is no other celebration, this provision is adequate. But in a parish it is far from satisfactory because there can be no reciprocity. And the refusal to permit Anglicans to participate in the celebrations of non-episcopal Churches will always carry with it the imputation that we are denying their orders and sacraments, however much we go on asserting that they are equally "within the Body". And it is this double talk, as Bishop Newbigin said in the same article, and as the Scots have said less politely since, which is fast earning us the reputation of perfidious Anglicans.

But there is no need for any lack of candour. Is it not possible to accept without pretence the situation as it actually is? The position in many places is that we can, and indeed must, spiritually speaking, break one loaf, but that we cannot at present do it through a single, mutually acknowledged ministry. Then should we not do it through our divided ministries together? Concelebration, with two (or more) ministers presiding at the table on behalf of the congregations they represent, meets those Anglicans who conscientiously believe that it is not a valid Eucharist unless celebrated by a priest; and at the same time it accepts as joint celebrant one who is in no way asked to deny the fulness of the ministry he has received.[1]

This is an interim arrangement, which indeed *solves* nothing; but equally it hides nothing. Indeed, to quote some words of an earlier article in which I argued the case more fully,[2] "the very necessity for the presence of at least two ministers in order that the Body of Christ in any given place may receive the sacrament of unity is a reminder, not a cloaking, of the judgement involved. But at least it does open the way for mercy to rejoice over judgement." And that, where the situation is ripe, is a saving necessity.

For it is by partaking of the one loaf that we, who are many, are made one Body. That is the essential truth enshrined in the Archbishop's proposal that intercommunion should be seen as the means to union and not merely as the fruit of it. And the validity of that truth has been reinforced for me beyond any contradiction by the experience over the past eight years of being able to break one bread in a college chapel: this joint participation made us one as nothing else could. What is not nearly so clear is that we should attempt to use what is properly the basis of union as a means of making such intercommunion possible. If we are not yet ready to unite our

[1] Even in a college chapel there would be much to be said for acknowledging that this is now a genuinely ecumenical community by the appointment of a Free Church Chaplain to work, and concelebrate, with the Anglican Dean required by statute.

[2] "Intercommunion and Concelebration", *The Ecumenical Review*, April 1957, pp. 263–6.

Churches, then to unite our ministries so that meanwhile we can enjoy intercommunion involves, as Bishop Newbigin remarked, "an abandonment of the great truth in this realm to which Anglicanism has borne witness, namely the indissoluble relation between sacramental fellowship and the total life of the Church".[1] And to demand episcopacy as the deposit on the ecclesiastical "never never" is to devalue episcopacy (even if the deposit were to be paid, which it won't be) with no guarantee of ultimate union.

Nothing lasting will be achieved till we cease to be separated Churches, with an integrated ministry and a new freedom in unity such as South India has discovered. Let us back with our prayers, and with our pressure, those who are conversing on our behalf if they really go for the big thing. But if we *are* to have an interim stage, then let it be one that really challenges the local congregation to unity. If there were two congregations, however episcopal, meeting at separate tables within a single college, it would be intolerable—and the non-Christians would never believe we were one. Ultimately, as Bishop Newbigin insisted again, the only convincing test of unity is that the Christian family in any one place should visibly be seen to *be* one family, breaking one loaf. And it is here, too, that the real cost comes. But this is not the cost that the present proposals for intercommunion force us to face. They ask us (or, let us be honest, they ask the Methodists) whether we are prepared for certain changes in Church order, in order that we can go on living separately, in however close relations.

Let us negotiate for unity, not for intercommunion, at the top. But meanwhile let us press forward *through intercommunion* from below. Let the one loaf in the one place, the one common Christian life, *despite* our divisions on order, be the spiritual reality that compels us to a common structure and a common episcopacy. If we begin by duplicating bishops, then I have a fear that nothing very urgent will drive us to union. But once a sufficient number of congregations know themselves so close in Christ and his work that they *cannot but* break one loaf, even through our divided ministries, then the demand for a single ministry and a single Church cannot be far behind.

A more promising way forward than that outlined in the Report has since been provided by the proposed establishment, at the suggestion of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the leaders of the Methodist Church, of a shared church in the new housing area of Greenhill, Kent. In a letter to *The Times*[2] the Vicar and the Superintendent Methodist minister said: "We have agreed to alternate Mattins and Methodist morning service, Evensong and Methodist evening service on alternate Sundays, with the Anglican Holy Communion service on Sunday morning at or before 9 a.m. Both denominations will use the Methodist Hymn Book, and Anglicans and Methodists will be

[1] Op. cit., p. 225. Cf. T. F. Torrance in *Essays in Anglican Self-criticism* (ed. D. M. Paton), pp. 202–5.

[2] 29 June 1959.

welcomed at the services of the other." Intercommunion is not at the moment in question. But can anyone doubt that the demand for it will become insistent, if the two congregations really grow together in the Spirit? In such a situation concelebration would seem the obvious answer to an otherwise intolerable frustration. And, as another joint letter to *The Times* said,[1] if this is the way forward in an expanding area, why not in "the immediate and infinitely larger problem of inter-church relationships presented by the 'established' area"?

It is a sign of real hope that the heart of the problem of intercommunion should have shifted from the admission of *individuals* to the sacrament in isolated or occasional situations (though this, of course, remains a genuine problem) to the coming together of Christian *congregations* to know themselves as the Body of Christ in any given place. This restates the issue in its normative and properly corporate terms, opens the way to fresh understanding of the one loaf, and points us, I believe, a new path to unity.

JOHN WOOLWICH.

Commentaries and Books on St Luke's Gospel

THE distinction made between pastoral and academic works is useful but only approximate; faced with it, as with any *entweder . . . oder,* one's immediate reaction is to ask, "Why not both?" For purposes of convenience one may separate the pastoral, the pastoral-academic, and the more academic.

A: THE PASTORAL

The "devotional commentary on Luke" by J. M. E. Ross (1923) and the running commentary by E. W. S. Packard (1932) should stand high on any preacher's list; both are the works of scholars; the former has an illuminating account of the "Aramaic gospel of the Infancy stories" in Luke; the latter gives a translation different from both the A.V. and the R.V. and provides an excellent outline of meditation on sermon-themes with an occasional flash of insight from the much-loved "B. K." Cunningham, at whose feet Mr Packard and the present writer once sat. H. Martin's *Luke's Portrait of Jesus* (1949) is also the fruit of sound scholarship, and includes appropriate citations from writers as old as Augustine and as modern as William Temple. L. Ragg's commentary in the Westminster Series (1922) may disappoint critics searching for D.Phil. material about Luke, but it brings out the devotional and artistic side of the evangelist and would appeal to anyone with a knowledge of Dante or with a liking for the art galleries of Italy. K. Bornhaüser's *Studien zum Sondergut*

[1] 6 July 1959.

des Lukas (1934) may seem reactionary to many; but he applies great knowledge of the Talmud and other Jewish sources to the exegesis of ten Lucan parables, overemphasizing perhaps some details in the parables in a way that would make a disciple of Jülicher shudder and cry, "The master [Jülicher] said that Jesus never spoke in allegories, only in parables with never more than one point to make at a time!" But his search for Old Testament patterns of thought reminds one of the work of more recent typologists. W. Barclay's *The Gospel of Luke* and P. N. F. Young's *The Good News of Luke the Physician* (1937) are both to be commended, the former for its many apt citations, the latter for its scholarly basis, as models for leaders of study-groups. J. A. Findlay could never write anything not fresh or illuminating at many points; his work on Acts was followed by his *Gospel according to St Luke* (1937); his sections on asceticism, the social and economic background, the interest of Luke in women, Luke the townsman and the Greek, prayer, humour and pathos and the Gospel of the Holy Spirit are all stimulating.

B: The Pastoral-Academic

N. B. Stonehouse's *The Witness of Luke to Christ* (1951) shows how Christ-centred Luke's thought is. Here wide reading and deep learning are worn lightly. Though Luke's interests are said to be theological and Christological rather than historical, yet he is shown at every point to be concerned with historical fact, taking great pains to assure his readers that he is qualified to provide them with reliable information about what had taken place. Stonehouse defends repeatedly the accuracy of Luke and makes clear that the conception of Jesus' Messiahship is historical as well as theological. He stresses rightly the important part played by eyewitnesses in the early church and rejects the more extreme verdicts of the Formcritics who suggest that the evangelists wrote as products of the community and without direct contact themselves with eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. In a simple, learned commentary in the Century Bible Series (1922), W. F. Adeney brought out the humane characteristics of Luke, his joyousness, kindliness and liberality of spirit, his sympathy with the poor, the prominence that he gives to prayer and praise and to the position of women, and his interest in the domestic scene. H. Balmforth's commentary in the Clarendon Bible Series (1930) is excellent also on the subject of Luke's characteristics. The two hundred pages of notes based on the R.V. text are well balanced and written in a delightful style. Here is a conservative approach; there is no deep delving into problems about the miracles; but there is much to provide a fifth- or sixth-form pupil with food for thought in form or chapel. A much fuller commentary, that deserves to be far better known than it is, is by J. N. Geldenhuys (1950), a preacher and a scholar, educated at Princeton, Cambridge and Pretoria, and widely read in Dutch, German, French and English literature on the subject; the text of Nestle and the R.V. are made the basis of sound exposition and application of the gospel to life. Here is a commentary of which the Dutch Reformed Church may be proud. The hand

of the scholar may be seen in the discussion of the day and date of the Crucifixion and its relation to the Last Supper (where the views of Jeremias are anticipated), but the heart of the pastor is revealed throughout the book.

C: The More Academic

The older works of Harnack and Sir W. M. Ramsay are still well worth reading, especially the former's *Luke the Physician* (1907) and the latter's *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* (1898) and *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (1915). More than any others, these two scholars restored faith in the traditional belief that Luke–Acts was written by a companion of Paul and that his work is of great historical value. In these days, when "history" as applied to Luke–Acts is twisted to mean what is taken to be the historical situation of the church in c. A.D. 90, Ramsay's tale of archaeological research and his verification of Luke's trustworthiness (in which he had not believed when he began researching) are valuable correctives. As Dr Vincent Taylor has said in commenting on W. L. Knox's *Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* (1953 and 1957), "He is entirely justified in saying that the questions of history and authenticity cannot be adequately discussed before the closest detective work has been done on the synoptic sources; it is to be hoped that after the meagre harvest from Form-criticism, typology and existentialist treatment of the Gospels has been reaped (or gleaned), students will turn with renewed interest to the neglected fields of synoptic criticism."

Several typically solid German commentaries on Luke have been written, including those by J. Jeremias (1930) and by E. Klostermann (2nd ed., 1929). These show sound knowledge of the papyri and inscriptions as well as of pagan and Rabbinic authors. Of these, F. Hauck's (1934) may be taken as an example; his commentary runs to 300 pages or so, with valuable notes on chronology, the forgiveness of sin, the concept of a neighbour and prayer. His view is that Luke rests on Mark, Q and another source, Luke turning from one to another as he worked; Luke 1–2 came from a special source, then Mark was used, 3. 1–9. 50, then Q, 9. 51–13. 55, and then Mark even for the Passion story; Luke was a faithful source-copyist and can be trusted more than Matthew to give us Q's order at least. Luke thus combined very Jewish–Christian material at his disposal with a Greek-sounding prologue and a Greek's interest in Jesus as *Soter* and *Euergetes,* the sinners' Saviour, the poor man's Friend, the Innocent one who had to suffer before his glory; Hauck believed that Luke included legends, like the infancy stories, the outstanding miracles and the appearances of the Risen Lord, taking "legend" to be the reflection and expression of the church's faith according to the ideas of the first century c. A.D. 70–80, and possessing therefore, he thought, religious value.

A few years before Hauck wrote, J. M. Creed's commentary in English was published in 1930. An Englishman brought up in the German tradition of scholarship, he greatly admired Bultmann and

Meyer, though he rejected the wilder speculations of Norden and of the French modernist Loisy; aware of the limitations of Form-criticism, he used the method cautiously; he owed much to the Roman Catholic M.-J. Lagrange's commentary, especially to his discussion of Luke's style, as he did to Wettstein and to Strack-Billerbeck for the classical and Jewish "parallels". Creed's work was far more critical than previous English commentaries, such as Plummer and Ragg; but it is a sane and judicious commentary and still holds the English field. Those who remember Creed's talks at the "D Society" at Cambridge will recollect his tendency to question the orthodox position at every point; as F. C. Burkitt once pointed out after such a talk, "After all, no Canon, no Creed". His treatment of the use made of Luke from the second century onwards stands out, as do his additional notes on the Magnificat and Benedictus with their Septuagintal parallels, and also on Lysanias. The clear, hard light of Creed's mind illuminated many points, but missed the subtle nuances and artistry of Luke. Creed could never have written as William Manson did in his admirable commentary in the Moffatt Series (1930) of this gospel "the most voluminous and varied, the most vibrant and sympathetic, the most beautiful and sweetly reasonable of all that we possess". Many other criticisms have been brought against what is still the standard English commentary on Luke. Creed followed Meyer and Wellhausen too blindly in supposing that Mark intended to end his book at 16. 8 with the word *γάρ*. (R. H. Lightfoot was to do the same four years later.) He dismissed Streeter's Proto–Luke theory too summarily in a footnote, refusing to tolerate the then new idea that Mark was not Luke's primary source and tending to think that material peculiar to Luke may have been created out of Marcan stories and neglecting the arguments on the other side, seen for instance in A. M. Perry's *Sources of Luke's Passion-narrative* (1920); he failed to give an adequate treatment of the miracles, especially of the Virgin Birth; and he ignored the work done by C. C. Torrey and by W. F. Howard on Luke's Semitisms, whether primary or secondary. He had much of the inflexibility of a German mind. But for its sound scholarship at so many points, it deserves the high regard in which it is held still.

In the Hibbert Journal for 1921 and in various editions of his *magnum opus, The Four Gospels,* which first appeared in that year, B. H. Streeter had put forward the view that Luke's primary source was not Mark, but a collection of Q and L (peculiar to Luke) material already formed together before Mark was used; this Proto–Luke is now to be seen in Luke 3. 1–4. 30, 5. 1–11, 6. 12–8. 7, 9. 51–18. 14, 19. 1–28, 37–44, 47 f., and (with some Marcan insertions) 22. 14–24. Dr Vincent Taylor took up this theory in his *Behind the Third Gospel* (1926), cf. his article in *J.T.S.,* 29, 1927–8, 147–55, against Dr Hunkin's attack. The theory has been misrepresented often by its critics as a theory of an entire gospel rather than of an early gospel-draft, which may never have been "published"; at the most it may have been sent to Luke's friends. (The present writer has suggested that something like Proto–Luke was the first treatise

sent to Theophilus, followed by Acts, then by the third Gospel as we have it, *E.T.*, lxiv, 1953, 283 ff., supported by H. G. Russell, *H.T.R.*, xlviii, 1955, 167 ff.) Many criticisms of the theory have fallen wide of their mark. None knows better than Dr Vincent Taylor what are the weaknesses of the theory; but until one has met with a reasoned answer (for abuse is not enough!) to his defence of the order as well as of the existence of Q (*J.T.S.*, 4, 1953, 27–31) and of the theory of Q + L as Proto-Luke (*E.T.*, 67, 1955, 12–16), one must give it the fair hearing that seems all too often to be denied to it. It is insufficient to say that there is no internal completeness about Proto-Luke, or that if one removes Mark from Luke the proportion of the latter is destroyed. The theory accounts for the so-called "omissions" of Marcan material by Luke, Mark not being his primary source; also for the place given carefully to the date in 3. 1 f. as well as for the differences between Mark's and Luke's Passion narratives. It may be that the great central section, 9. 51–18. 14, formed part of an early draft based on the theological belief that a new Deuteronomy had been given by Jesus (cf. Prof. C. F. Evans, *Studies in the Gospels*, 1955, ed. D. E. Nineham).

Both Hauck and Creed were indebted to H. J. Cadbury's *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (1919–20) and *The Making of Luke–Acts* (1927) that show great knowledge of the historical writings and literary habits and customs of the first century A.D. Like Creed, Cadbury dated Luke's Gospel c. 80–85. He considered the material at Luke's disposal, the modes of thought and writing in vogue at the time; Luke's individuality, for he was both a "curious" and a "gentlemanly" writer; and his purpose, which was to glorify Jesus and to present a defence of Paul at Rome to Theophilus, a judge. Christianity was politically harmless. Luke is more than a manipulator of sources and on the whole he is trustworthy, though his standards were those of ancient historians, anxious to achieve artistic effect rather than the accuracy that Luke claims. Cadbury brings out Luke's familiarity with Hebrew thought, particularly with Jewish–Messianic hopes. (This is no doubt true, for Luke must have had a long training in Jewish–Christianity before he met Paul.) There is a certain hypercritical element in Cadbury's work, due perhaps to the influence of Wellhausen and Loisy. Though he disproved Hobart's theory of the medical language of Luke, yet, as Creed himself said, he did not demolish "the relevance of some of the evidence which has been collected, and in a few cases he has unduly depreciated the force of the medical parallels". Most readers would think, in view of Luke's preface and Ramsay's researches, that Cadbury is wrong in denying that there are any special reasons for thinking that a companion of Paul would be accurate. Any hint of a rather stuffy atmosphere in an ivory tower has been dispelled by Cadbury's charming *The Book of Acts in History* (1955).

The influence of Creed is to be seen in H. K. Luce's commentary in the Cambridge Greek Bible Series (1933); it is especially good on textual criticism, and though it is intended chiefly for sixth-form students, it is "advanced"; it contains a good outline of the aims of

the Form-critics, to whom Luce gives too much credit, though he has some shrewd criticisms of their speculations.

A very different treatment from Hauck's and from Creed's is R. Morgenthaler's work in two parts, *Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis* (1948) on the style and form of Luke and his doctrinal basis. Luke used Mark and Q and is of great historical value; Luke intended his work to be history in the ordinary sense of the term; there is no necessary contrast between his "art" and his "history"; so the dogmas of the rationalists critics are challenged (ii, 111) and the Form-critics are roughly handled (ii, 107 f.). Luke is a great artist with an architectonic style (Morgenthaler anticipated Dr Farrer here) marked by parallelism and "Zweiheitsgesetz"; the latter "grouping in pairs" by Luke can hardly be squared with Dr Sparks' findings on Luke's partiality for groups of three! (*J.T.S.*, 37, 1936, 141–45) or with Luke's "omission" of Mark 6. 45–8. 26. By his study of chiasmus and clause-structure, Morgenthaler shows how indebted Luke was both to Greek rhetoricians and to the Septuagint. Sometimes he overstates his case for Luke being both a great historian and a great artist; and though he does not take textual criticism into account, and though he seems familiar with only German literature on Luke, his work is refreshing for its insistence on the historical value of Luke's writings; with it may be compared especially pp. 24–36 of H. Mclachlan's *St Luke, the man and his work* (1920), which are devoted to Luke the historian.

Insistence on both the historical and religious value of the Gospel is found in two other modern commentaries; one by William Manson, mentioned above, with its eighteen pages of introduction packed with learning and its notes based on the fresh and invigorating translation by Moffatt, which removes the film of familiarity with the A.V. which obscures for so many of us the wonder of the language. The other is the excellent one by A. R. C. Leaney (1958), setting out neatly the external and internal evidence for the authorship and rightly stressing the important part played by witnesses in the early church. Leaney finds no need for the Proto–Luke hypothesis (though he tends to treat it as if it claimed to be an entire gospel rather than a draft as early as Mark), but he deals well with those who would dispense with Q. The chief value of this work is seen in its emphasis on the theological overtones of the infancy narratives, where two sources are traced, and on the importance of what is called "Biblical Theology" seen throughout the commentary and in the special notes, particularly that on the Holy Spirit in Luke's Gospel. Scholars have moved away from the written-source theory taken the whole way, as it was, by B. S. Easton in 1926, though his commentary is still most useful for anyone with Huck's Synopsis open before him ready to compare gospel with gospel. In *A Portrait of Luke* by A. H. N. Green-Armytage (1955), the emphasis is on the strong dramatic unity of the gospel resulting in little concern for chronology and even in the suppression of the appearances of the Risen Lord in Galilee. The classical and late Greek of Luke is also stressed. As Luke is said to have depended on Mark, "Q is a mirage"

and Proto–Luke is never mentioned. Dr Farrer takes the same view (*Studies in the Gospels,* ed. D. E. Nineham, 1955, 55–8). Answers to the theory that Luke depended on Matthew have been given by W. H. Blyth Martin (Theology, 59, 1956, 431, 182–8) and E. L. Bradby (*E.T.*, 68, 1957, 315–8), as well as by A. R. C. Leaney. A fair statement and criticism of the Proto–Luke hypothesis are given by S. M. Gilmour in his commentary in the Interpreter's Bible Series, viii, 1952, in the introduction, which, like the notes on the text, is a model of conciseness.

Great attention has been paid recently to Luke 1–2, partly owing to the resurgence of typological exegesis and eisegesis, though Ch. II of E. C. Selwyn's *St Luke the Prophet* (1901) shoud have satisfied the most ardent typologist! M. D. Goulder and M. L. Sanderson (*J.T.S.*, 8, 1957, 12–30) made an interesting attempt to treat the chapters as Luke's Genesis, and J. Manék has found (in later chapters) the *New Exodus in the Books of Luke* (Novum Testamentum 2, 1957, 8–23). If Luke had his Genesis, Exodus and Deuteronomy (cf. C. F. Evans' article mentioned above), it would not take much ingenuity to find the rest of the Pentateuch somewhere in his Gospel too. A fuller treatment of these chapters is found in R. Laurentin's *Structure et Théologie de Luc i–ii* (1957), and several attempts have been made by P. Winter to reach the sources of these chapters, cf. his *The Proto-source of Lk. i,* Novum Testamentum, I, 1956, 184–99; and the discussion between him and N. Turner in *New Testament Studies,* I, ii, 111–21 (1954) and II, ii, 100–9 (1955); cf. Winter's article on the Magnificat and Benedictus in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* 1954, 328–47. From such detailed studies, as these are, of material peculiar to Luke there may emerge in time a clearer conception of his theological emphases.

C. S. C. Williams.

Liturgy and Dogma

My argument in this article will be that liturgy and dogma, like body and soul, are mutually dependent and that in separation each is bound to lose its specific character and meaning.

It is a truth, I believe, in need of stressing. Diversity of temperament and interest may and do easily lead Christians to emphasize either worship at the expense of creed or creed at the expense of worship. When liturgy loses touch with dogma—as Anglicans perhaps are in a special position to know—it becomes little more than a vehicle of aesthetic emotion; its use and value are assessed on artistic grounds alone and individual caprice tends to have the last word. ("At St ——'s I always did so-and-so." "My people like to have it that way.") In ceasing, that is, to be the body of which dogma is the soul liturgy forfeits its proper objectivity, so that form determines content rather than content form. The result is dilettantism and irresponsibility. Alternatively, a purely historical judgment prevails. Everything must

now conform to the models of "correctness" established by antiquarian research, whether applicable or not to existing conditions. To do other than follow the chosen pattern—ancient or medieval, Western or Eastern—is to show oneself, liturgically speaking, an outsider. Considerations of intrinsic worth are dismissed as irrelevant. Yet a third procedure is to adopt *en bloc* whatever is sanctioned by the ecclesiastical authority which for reasons of one's own one elects to regard as final. In the Church of England picking and choosing of this sort is again, alas, too familiar to need instancing.

Ritualist aestheticism calls for no discussion; it cannot be defended on any principle and against it rational argument is unavailing. But what of the other motives? Each appeals to a recognizable criterion, affects to be objective and disclaims mere individualism. Both, however, are more subjective than is apt to be supposed. If liturgy and dogma are interdependent it is the latter (or its handmaid, theology) which supplies the *rationale*. The liturgical enthusiast may select his model on grounds ostensibly historical, but his preference is likely no less to be governed by personal taste and uncriticized theological assumptions. Further, where antiquarian interest is really strong, the more rigidly is the model liable to impose itself, and detail becomes all-important. The substance of religion is then in effect identified with the formalities of worship and liturgical purism with sincerity of faith.

On the other hand, where the liturgical tradition is alive and its relation with dogma fertile there can be no question of a slavish "correctness". Rather is there freedom. A vital belief is creative of new liturgical designs and provides the inspiration and impulse of which cultus is the natural embodiment. Form so controlled cannot degenerate into formalism. At no period of the Church's history was this relation so evident as in the early centuries. Liturgical freedom was then real enough and the "shape" of liturgy had not become an end in itself. But in the middle ages the connexion was loosened; liturgy became less and less intelligible because increasingly the occasion only of a work of individual piety. What ensued was ritualism in the worst sense of the word: rites and ceremonies performed for their own sakes and often not understood even by the clergy themselves. Unfortunately, the ritualist revival of the last century was largely medieval in inspiration. The more scholarly interest of our own day is so far right in seeking not only its frame of reference in theology but its norms—without too much imitativeness—in a remoter age.

When dogma is divorced from liturgy a similar aberration occurs: it becomes mere theory. Its criterion is then its logical coherence as a means of "possessing" divine truth within a conceptual scheme. But intellectualism is really no less subjective than ritualism; for doctrine without worship soon forgets the data of concrete experience. Error of this kind also can assume more than one guise. It may simply be the abstract speculation of an individual thinker: true doctrine is what I myself maintain. Or, paradoxically, it may spring from sentiment: one "feels", or has a "hunch", that this or that is

the truth. But the sentimentalism for which faith is only an emotional posture is in the long run solvent for all dogmatic belief. Yet again there is the snare, just now very prevalent, of a pedantic orthodoxism, where, as in ritual, "style" is all. Such, it seems to me, has been the line taken by many contemporary biblical theologians, for whom whatever is not biblical lacks the acceptable tone. Indeed, among the extremer biblicists Scripture, virtually lifted from its historical context, becomes a timeless oracle, a muniment-house of religious phraseology abiding no question. Another variety of orthodoxism is of course the "confessionalist" movement, of which neo-Calvinism is the signal example. The historic confession, as the standard of truth, is supposedly sacrosanct. Yet reaction may be as personal and arbitrary as revolution, and in the sort of confessionalism we connect with Karl Barth's name notoriously is so.

Subjectivism then is to be found in both camps, and exhibits a notable parallelism. No doubt the stickler for strict doctrine will hardly think of his own position as subjective, a fault he is always vocal in repudiating, any more than does the liturgical purist. But theology detached from liturgy is thought detached from the existential reality with which liturgy, when not antiquarianized, is in immediate *rapport*. No longer moved by the actuality of a vital experience, temperamental preference or prejudice will exert as strong an influence as did the individualist rationalism of the liberal epoch. There is nothing especially sacred about the confessions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Who nowadays would claim for the Thirty-nine Articles that they constitute the necessary touchstone of sound doctrine? Yet has the Augsburg or the Westminster or any other confession a more demonstrable authority? The fact is that theological freedom is as distasteful to the orthodoxist as is liturgical independence to the ritualist. Clearly enough some theological eras are better than others: truer to experience or of greater stimulus to thought. There are "classical" periods, contrasting with periods of decadence and stagnation. But mere slavish adherence to theological classicism defeats the very purposes for which theology exists: namely, to nourish and enlarge the spiritual life under conditions that inevitably are ever changing.

To the question, Wherein therefore do liturgy and dogma have their essential bond of unity? there is only one reply: in the living Christ himself. His is the informing spirit of both. Nevertheless, the needs of a reasonable faith press us for a more detailed answer. How, first, does dogma stand to Christ? Our Lord, as the divine Logos, is, we believe, the supreme utterance of God to man. God gives us the language by means of which alone we can hold effective communion with himself, in the power of that divine *enabling* which we speak of as the Spirit. But the outcome of this revelation is the creation of a community of responsive *persons*—the Church. And it is only in this community, among this People of God—Christ's Body, as St Paul calls it—that either dogma or liturgy has or can have significance and value. Here alone is dogma a light or liturgy a channel of life.

In the bond of the Spirit Christ and his Church have all things in common; as in truth they must if the latter indeed be his Body. That Word which is both life and light belongs to the community established by the Spirit in Christ, who is the Word incarnate. Dogma, in interpreting our existence in this world, is a function of it.[1] But the light of dogma has its necessary object and counterpart in the life of the community whose vital centre is its worship. Liturgy is at once the expression and the medium of the new life in Jesus Christ, the differentiating quality of which is described by the words "faith", "hope" and "charity". What these indicate let us briefly consider.

Faith, which for the Christian is primary and basic, has its liturgical embodiment in the formal and public confession of belief: initially and principally in baptism; but also daily in the creed. This repeated affirmation signifies the reiterated Yes of personal conviction, with its consequent renunciation of the world, the flesh and the devil and resolve to keep God's holy will and commandments. Thus what usually is done impersonally, in infancy, through the corporate faith of the Church becomes a sustained act of personal witness before men that in Christ alone is there life eternal. Hope, accordingly, is this same assurance ripening within us into a confident expectation. Its liturgical expression is twofold: prayer, in the name of Jesus Christ, and the repeated forthtelling of the Kerygma. In the former we draw near to Christ as the one who has prepared for us "such good things as pass man's understanding" and look forward to the final consummation in which he will be all in all. Yet prayer is itself a testimony to the truth "as it is in Christ Jesus": the simple petition, "Thy Kingdom come", proclaims the sovereign purpose of God both in time and beyond. *Lex orandi, lex credendi.* Lastly, in charity, divine *agape*, the indwelling life of Christ reaches its fruition. However, as the continuation within us of what is begun in faith and nurtured in hope, it is not simply a virtue to be attained over and above all others, but the condition under which alone any virtue can be fully realized. For charity means a change of heart. Liturgically it has its richest symbolical embodiment in the eucharist as the memorial of Christ's sacrifice "for us men and for our salvation". This, re-presenting the death of him who gave himself as "a ransom for many" from the thrall of sin, is both a continuous proclamation of the divine love that redeems and an anticipation of the perfect fellowship to be achieved in God's Kingdom yet to come. On our part it is the unique occasion for the offering of our own "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving": only because God first offers himself to us in the sacramental Body and Blood can we fitly dedicate ourselves, "our souls and bodies", to him. If our self-oblation is acceptable it is through the new life which is given us in

[1] Dogma, properly speaking, is a term to be used by Christians only in the singular, as being the articulation in formal language of the one *Verbum Dei*. Its content is Christ alone. What it offers is the accepted doctrine about Christ in so far as men can adequately state it. In conveying the knowledge that Christ is Lord and Saviour it fulfils its task of spiritual illumination.

Christ and which is ever renewed by our feeding on him spiritually, in faith and with thanksgiving. For the whole reciprocal sacrificial action is to the divine glory alone.

Liturgy may thus be described as an articulation of the life of the crucified and risen Lord *in us*, a life realized through faith, hope and charity. We should notice, however, the particular bond which exists between it and dogma in their common reliance upon verbal utterance. Both, in the first place, are vehicles of the Word of God. Dogma I have described as light, and the knowledge and understanding to which it leads us must necessarily disclose itself in intelligible form. The divine Word is imparted, that is, not in a hidden cipher but in a language which men can comprehend. Consequently it is a property of dogma to be rational. That it may also be spoken of as a mystery in no way implies that every attempt to interpret it philosophically is an impropriety. On the contrary, all we mean—and the point is vital—is that its grounds are not to be looked for elsewhere than in the always deepening but never fully elucidated experience to which man's reception of God's Word gives rise.

That liturgy depends on verbal communication is equally obvious. The heart confesses with the mouth. But the heart is the source of the confession: worship is not lip-service only. Liturgical patterns give expression to essential *motifs* of human existence itself. The formal declaration of faith in the creed signifies submission of the "whole man" to the divine will; the uttered word is but the pointer to a total action. So too with prayer: what the mouth petitions heart and will anticipate in deed; what it offers—the stereotyped "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving"—is nothing short of an oblation of all that the worshipper, by God's grace, is or can be.

But there is yet a further relation between liturgy and dogma; and this we can best explain by showing what each implies for the other. To describe dogma as a "soul" for which liturgy is the "body", or liturgy as the "life" for which dogma is a "light", is purely metaphorical. What exactly do these figures represent? Light, of course, is necessary to life; without it we are blind; and if life be a journey, sight is a condition of our progress thereon. But the way of faith, hope and charity leads, from perdition, to salvation in Christ—a road for which the light of truth is indispensable. Dogma affords us this in the knowledge it conveys of Jesus Christ and his redemptive work. It touches liturgy, therefore, at the latter's central point—its voicing of the Christian expectation in prayer and Kerygma. This means that in prayer to God, as in the preaching of saving truth to the world, significant utterance derives only from the power of Christ and his victory over sin. This, indeed, is what his "name" verily stands for. But what the power and the victory fully involve we learn only gradually and by effort. Neither the Church's prayer nor its preaching is ever a perfect fulfilment of an ideal. Such enlightenment as it possesses, however, is enshrined in the dogma whose sole custodian it is.

But whence does dogma itself receive its light? In other words, what is the basis of its authority? For the heirs of the Reformation

there can of course be only one answer: the Bible. Dogma as a source of knowledge is not self-sufficing; nor are its statements, being historically conditioned, ever more than relatively definitive. As Jesus himself belongs to history, so the Church's faith in Christ is a historical growth. Thus the Word of God is not an abstract truth delivered in a timeless formula but an existential reality grounded in persons and events. No proposition *about* Christ can exhaust the Word's meaning; for the function of all such propositions is selective and symbolic only—to point, by signs and analogies, to an aspect only of the truth, not to attempt to present it intact, which they cannot do. But if Jesus Christ is for the believer the Way, the Truth and the Life, the question is implicit: Who then is he? and this explains the form which dogma takes. What the latter does, however, is simply to represent—no more but not less—that experience of which the Scriptures are the unique record and final testimony.

Dogma, I have claimed, is most fully integrated with liturgy in prayer and preaching. Without doctrinal substance these would be mere verbalism. Can we wonder that where the positive conviction and expression of faith are lacking church "services", as ritual performances, seem only an irrelevancy and a waste of time? Deprived of the light of an apprehended truth the life of religion is bound to decay. So must we guard against the type of liturgical revivalism which despises preaching as "subjective" and "Protestant". The sermon is an inherent part of the liturgical act, a particular and *ad hoc* delivery of the authoritative doctrine from which alone all worship is orientated.

But what, on the other hand, are the implications of liturgy for dogma? If the latter is to be of more than theoretical interest—although purely *as* theory it is without interest—it must apply to the actual conditions of the Christian's life, must itself appear as a function of that life. Liturgy gives dogma its necessary existential context, in which the latter assumes its alone significant role of "saving truth", *gospel*. For the purpose of dogma is practical and its criterion pragmatic. It is not a science, nor a metaphysic of being. It appertains only to the needs and circumstances of the moral life of men in their concrete situations. Liturgy as the characteristic and determinative manifestation of the religious impulse translates dogma into the only medium for which it is appropriate. Apart from liturgy the formal articulations of faith which antiquity has bequeathed us are but the mythical husks of truth.

The integral relation of liturgy and dogma is evident when we consider the respective meanings of theology and rite. Dogma, I have urged, is ancillary to liturgy. Its use is fulfilled in prayer and the proclamation of saving truth. Theology as an intellectual reflexion upon dogma particularizes this function. The liturgical tradition is not static and seeks an always closer approximation to the reality of Christ; error, therefore, must be eliminated from its expressions; and for this a live, scripturally grounded doctrine is the instrument. Theology is thus a dominant factor in all liturgical reform: it enables liturgy, whilst remaining biblical, to become sensitive

to the new demands of a changing intellectual and social environment.

To discharge this task two conditions are necessary: theology must be objective; and it must enjoy freedom. Its objectivity is constituted by its basis in dogma, which, by means of faith, conveys, as I have said, the knowledge of Jesus Christ and what he signifies—the knowledge that in him only is the assured way of salvation for mankind. Faith, of course, is indispensable; for without it religion offers nothing to which the term "knowledge" can rightly be referred. But this does not imply that dogma is itself the object of faith. We believe not in dogma but in God. We do so, however, *through* dogma; for faith is what, on our part, establishes our relation with God, and whatever deepens that relation, in the enhancement of our understanding, is germane to the life of religion. Thought, our highest faculty, has the lead in bringing us into conscious dependence upon God and deliberate submission to his will. And this precisely is theology's purpose: to clarify our knowledge of God "in Christ Jesus". In so far as it ever loses its dogmatic objectivity, to become merely an exercise of speculative curiosity, it fails of that purpose. It then can no longer serve, through liturgy, to mediate the continuous redemptive "event" of Christian experience.

But if the basis of theology is always a recognized historical datum it also must possess a counterbalancing freedom of movement. Without this it will be unable to discharge its intellectual vocation. Dogma, whilst itself not in principle unchanging, at least in its modes, is in practice fixed; but the theologian can do no constructive work if his hands are tied by an immobile traditionalism. He must be awake to the needs of his times and free to adapt the expression of Christian belief to the requirements of the Church's kerygmatic responsibility. This exacts an essential liberty of interpretation, whether of dogma or of the Bible.

The necessary condition of a sound theology, therefore, is the maintenance of the tension between the historic inheritance of dogma and the demands of new ways of thinking. But for the authority of the one we shall have only heresy; but for the novelty of the other only an obscure and self-stultifying orthodoxism.

As, however, we distinguish between dogma and theology, so must we also between liturgy and rite. Of both of them is dogma—to revert to our simile—the light. But liturgy, as is nowadays better understood, has its own autonomy, and this is manifested in the varying types and forms of its ritual. In its objectivity and stability it is parallel to dogma; in its freedom and mobility it resembles theology. The unchanging datum of liturgy is the sacraments, for the intrinsic "virtues" of the Christian life—its faith, its hope and its charity—are inseparable from the means of grace. These are fundamental. All Christian worship relates to them; and apart from them, indeed, would cease to be Christian. Nevertheless, the variable element in liturgy must have recognition. Once again this consists mainly in prayer and homily. But the expression of hope cannot be dissociated from that of faith and charity. No aspect of the liturgy,

therefore, lies outside the possibility of variation. The confession of faith, the representation of sacrifice, the utterance of praise and thanksgiving are all subject to the modifications of *form* which the changing context of Christian experience demands. Thus only can the liturgical tradition renew its vitality.

Yet the sheet-anchor of Scripture must remain. The service which contemporary biblical study has rendered is to have made clearer the characteristic scriptural *motifs*. Homily plainly is in its debt, though the preacher's task—and this is too often overlooked—involves more than the mere iteration of biblical phrases. Neither the proclamation of faith, nor prayer nor praise has any other authorization than what Scripture itself may warrant, any more than dogma is justified in availing itself of the disclosures of an alleged arcane tradition or the impromptu speculations of a novelty-seeking rationalism. The great virtue of the Anglican liturgy, in which it bears the deep impress of Cranmer's own convictions, is that it is consistently scriptural. It has preserved the basic elements of stability, even if at the cost of inflexibility and monotony. And no reformist alterations may be envisaged which are at all likely to impair this essential merit.

B. M. G. Reardon.

Who Inhabiteth Eternity[1]

Ps. 96. 1–4: O sing unto the Lord a new song: sing unto the Lord, all the whole earth.

Sing unto the Lord and praise his name: be telling of his salvation from day to day.

Declare his honour unto the heathen: and his wonders unto all people.

For the Lord is great and cannot worthily be praised; he is more to be feared than all gods.

Who is this Lord, to whom we are to sing a new song? To whom the whole earth should be singing? How shall we tell of his salvation? How declare his honour and his wonders so that they shall kindle the enthusiasm of the heathen and of all people?

If you look up this psalm in the revised version of the Bible you will find that the word "Lord" is printed in small capitals. That means, as you all know, that in the original Hebrew it was the sacred name, Jehovah or Jahweh. It is not just any kind of God to whom we are to sing our new song. It is the God who was making himself known under that name to his chosen people. We Christians believe him to have been, and to be, the only God there is. Those of us who to-day read the Bible with the minds of reasonably educated twentieth-century Christians see the Old Testament as the record of God educating our spiritual ancestors in knowledge of himself, an educative process which reached its climax in his revelation of himself in Jesus Christ. Nor was that the end. The crucified and risen Lord Jesus gave to his followers the gift of the Holy Spirit with the

[1] Matriculation Sermon preached at the General Theological Seminary, New York, on the Eve of All Saints, 1958.

promise that the Spirit should guide them into all truth by taking of the things of Christ and declaring them unto them.

Think what all this means. God has been educating man in knowledge of himself, an educative process to which the key is to be found in the figure of Jesus Christ, God incarnate, God living a human life in the history of this world in space and time. This is the key to what went before. In the Old Testament we distinguish true from false teaching about God by asking whether what is said, or implied, about God is consistent with the character of God as made known in Jesus Christ. It is the key to what has come after, but in a somewhat different way. The climax of the revelation was given in the historic figure of Jesus Christ. That revelation stands, once and for all. But by the guidance of the Spirit our understanding of it, and of what it implies, grows and deepens as the years go by. And the end is not yet.

The end is not yet. God, who has been and still is educating us men in knowledge of himself—he is the God who is described in the 57th chapter of Isaiah as "the high and holy one who inhabiteth eternity". Think what it means that he is eternal. We creatures of space and time may grow in knowledge as the years go by. We can look back to see what we have learnt in the past. We can reflect on the present state of our knowledge. We can look forward and hope to learn more. As we look forward, there is he, from our point of view way on before, looking back to us to call us on. He is not only to be thought of as the Creator who in the past has called the universe into existence. He is not only to be thought of as the Redeemer who has lived as man and died and risen to rescue it from evil. He is not only to be thought of as the Spirit who is now opening our eyes to understand more fully the meaning of that revelation. In all three Persons, as Father, Son and Spirit, he is *alpha* as well as *omega,* the end as well as the beginning. He is the God who from on before us is calling us on to learn what more he has to teach us as the Spirit takes of the things of Christ and declares them unto us to guide us into all truth.

I have now been a professor of theology in the University of Oxford for over twenty years. Add to these the six happy years in which I was a professor of theology here. I am taking this subject for my sermon to-night because of my conviction that of all men we theologians are most in danger of neglecting this truth. Suppose some question comes up on which we have to decide what we are to do, some question which involves theological issues—pacifism it may be, or the manufacture and testing of H bombs, or contraception, or homosexuality, or artificial insemination, intercommunion between different churches in divided Christendom, or the ordination of women. We argue and discuss these questions. We ask what will be the result of this or that line of conduct for the good of society and the welfare of mankind. Sooner or later someone is sure to say, "These questions of practical politics, these utilitarian considerations, important as they are, are secondary. We must go deeper. We must realize that they involve theological questions and seek for

theological answers" Then, nine times out of ten, if not ninety-nine times out of a hundred, according to his school of thought, he will think to find his theological answers by finding something with a bearing on the issue in the Hebrew prophets, in the writings of St Paul, in the Greek or Latin Fathers or the Councils of the undivided church, in St Thomas Aquinas, in the Reformation Divines, or in some other voice from the theological past.

We must know all this theology of the past. That is what we theologians are here for—to study the revelation of God in Christ in the light of the insights to be gained from prophets and apostles, from patristics and scholastics, from reformers and carolines, from evangelicals and tractarians, to learn to distinguish genuine growth in insight from wild speculation and lapses into bypaths of error. But when we have done all that, two questions remain to be faced.

First, all human thought is conditioned by the fact that the thinker thinks from the point of view of his own age and culture and personal characteristics. Whether we are studying biblical writers or later theologians we have to be trying to disentangle genuine insight from colouring, and possibly miscolouring, due to their outlook. Theological scholarship is largely occupied with seeking increased accuracy in exegesis, that is to say with grasping more truly and fully what the documents we are studying meant in the minds of their writers and of those for whom they were originally written. So much is this so that we tend to think that when we have discovered and expounded what St Paul or St Athanasius or St Thomas Aquinas really thought our work is done. We forget that all this work is only preparatory to our asking what is for us the vital question: "What must the truth have been and be if it looked like this to men who thought like that?"

Secondly, we have to be asking whether in the question before us there are elements which are genuinely new. Is the question itself one which has not previously arisen in the history of mankind? Or is it that conditions have so changed that in the circumstances of to-day it is impossible now to find the right answer simply by appealing to precedents in the past? Is it possible that God, the eternal God, who is on before us—is it possible that God is calling to us out of what from our point of view is our future, calling on us to make the truly creative response of recognizing as his will for us something that has not been done before?

Let me illustrate all this by reference to two instances of what I believe to be growing points for theology to-day.

Take first the relation of the church to the world. When Christianity began it was taken for granted by everyone that religion exists for the benefit of religious people, that a religious body exists for the benefit of its members. This was not only how the Jews thought about being the "chosen people"; in the live religions of the Hellenistic world men were initiated into the mysteries in order to participate in the benefits promised to the initiates. When St Peter preached the first Christian sermon and exhorted his hearers to repent and be baptized into the Christian church for the remission of their sins,

this was inevitably taken to be an invitation to join a body which had a superior status in relation to God, which was being rescued for eternal bliss out of the perishing world. It would be unreasonable to expect either St Peter or his hearers to have thought of it in any other way.

Twenty centuries of Christian theology have not succeeded in getting this notion out of our minds. It still inspires numberless evangelistic crusades, and books and reports of church committees on evangelism. Yet this century's study of the Gospels shows it to be inconsistent with the revelation of God in Christ. The sheer impact of historical study has erased the picture of Jesus as a human ethical and religious teacher who made no claims on his own behalf to any supernatural status—witness the closing pages of Dr Easton's *The Gospel Before the Gospels*. We have come to see that we cannot read the New Testament in its context in contemporary Jewish literature without seeing that at the heart of our Lord's thought about himself, from which spring all his deeds and his words, was the conviction that he was called to be God's Messiah holding—in whatever particular sense you interpret that title and that vocation—a unique status in relation to both God and man. "He came unto his own and his own received him not." They could not recognize in him the Messiah because he would not be the kind of Messiah they looked for. He would not "take his power and reign". He came not to be ministered unto but to minister, to empty himself and take the form of a servant, to give his life a ransom for many. We have come to see, too, that as a matter of history the Christian church did not come into existence by the banding together of the individual disciples of a revered teacher, but was commissioned to be the messianic community by the Lord who knew himself to be the Messiah. All this is now common stock of our theological teaching. But have we begun to realize how deeply our current idea of evangelism reflects an idea of the church which is inconsistent with the revelation of God in Christ; that the revelation which he wrought in the idea of messiahship involves a parallel revolution in the idea of the messianic community, the church; that we should not think of being baptized into the church as being gathered into the company of the saved but as being enlisted in the body in and through which the crucified, risen and ascended Messiah wills to continue his working for the rescue of God's creation from all that prevents it from reflecting and manifesting the glory and beauty and majesty of its Creator?

So to our thought about God himself. If what I have said is true of the church, we cannot think of God as one who is only interested in saving a certain number of souls for eternal bliss while he scraps the rest—which is what the heathen and the peoples think we are singing about when we sing our old songs. We must relate our doctrine of redemption to a more articulate doctrine of creation, one that thinks of God as interested in all that makes for the glory and beauty of the world of his creation and the welfare of his creatures. We must relate our concern for our sins to his call to us

to share in his interests and to give ourselves to their service. Have you grasped the significance of the order of the clauses in the Lord's Prayer? We are first to pray that God's name may be hallowed. His name: that means what he has revealed to us of himself in the manner of his creation and in Christ. We are to pray that all men everywhere may see the world as his creation and show their reverence for him by their manner of using the vast forces of nature which he has put, and through progress in scientific research is putting, more and more into our hands. We are to pray that his kingdom may come and his will be done: that men may express their reverence by acknowledging his lordship in every department of life, that our personal lives may be devoted to the finding and doing of his will, that all our laws, institutions, customs and habits, be they social, industrial, commercial, financial, political, national, international or what not, may be directed to that end. It is when we have ceased to be concerned about ourselves in our care for God's concern for his creation that we may ask for our daily bread, for the economic substratum necessary for his service. Then, and only then, do we see our sins in their true light: we see how our pride, our laziness, our cowardice, our selfishness, our lust and all the rest of them hamstring our response to his call to share in his interests and give ourselves in his service.

In three years' time those of you for whom this is the year of matriculation will be going out from here—sent forth by God equipped with all that this place has to give you, sent forth by God into his world to find and do the work that he has waiting for you there. For others the call will come sooner, in one year or two. Whenever the time comes, as you go you are to sing unto him a new song, the song of those who see that he is not simply interested in saving some of us out of this world for another, that he is interested in all that we can do—in all that all men and women can do towards enabling his creation, as I have put it, to manifest the glory and beauty and majesty of its Creator.

With this vision of God we can go forth to call on the whole earth to join in singing our new song, the new song in which we praise his *name,* praise him for the deeper understanding that he is giving us of himself. We can tell of his salvation as salvation from whatever there may be in ourselves that clogs and hampers us in his service. We can declare his honour unto the heathen and his wonders to all people. The Lord whom we believe in is the Lord who reveals himself as indeed great, as one who cannot worthily be praised. And when in our song we say that he is more to be feared than all gods we utter a word of warning to those of us who are theologians, for to be content with yesterday's understanding of God's self-revelation is to join in the worship of false gods to-day.

LEONARD HODGSON.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Robinson, who was Fellow and Dean of Clare College, Cambridge, from 1951 to 1959, is now Bishop of Woolwich.

The Rev. C. S. C. Williams is Fellow and Chaplain of Merton College, Oxford.

The Rev. B. M. G. Reardon is Rector of Kelly, Lifton, Devon.

Dr Hodgson was Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford from 1944 to 1958.

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

There are, as I understand it, three main points in Prof. Niebuhr's argument that Christian missionary activity among the Jewish people should cease.

I. Such activities are wrong, so far as the Jews are concerned, because they are futile.

II. The two faiths (viz. Judaism and Christianity) are sufficiently alike for the Jew to find God more easily in terms of his own religious heritage than by subjecting himself to the hazards of guilt-feeling involved in conversion to a faith which, whatever its excellence, must appear to him as a symbol of an oppressive majority culture.

III. Practically nothing can purify the symbol of Christ as the image of God in the imagination of the Jew from the taint with which ages of Christian oppression in the name of Christ tainted it.

To deal with the first argument at the outset, the facts surely do not support it. The one period when missionary activity among the Jewish people was given priority by the Christian Church was the apostolic period, when St Paul and the other Christian missionaries invariably went first to the synagogue and gave the first opportunity of hearing the Gospel to the Jews. Invariably the nucleus of the local Church was found among the Jews, proselytes and "devout persons" who attended the synagogue. In this New Testament period these missionary activities were anything but futile. From the Day of Pentecost onwards they were marked with outstanding success.

True, during the Dark Ages, when the Church neglected the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews and saw them rather as fit subjects for persecution, there were few converts, but then there was practically no missionary activity. Misguided attempts to compel Jews to accept baptism by force only served to widen the gulf between Church and Synagogue and to harden the prejudice against Christ, the Cross and everything Christian in the Jewish heart. If, however, Niebuhr is primarily concerned with the missionary movement of the last 150 years it is difficult to see how these activities can

fairly be described as "futile". True, the work has nearly always been of an individual character and there has never been a "mass movement" of Jews to Christianity. Yet it has been estimated that during the nineteenth century alone some 250,000 European Jews became Christians, and it has been claimed by competent students of missionary history that "proportionately conversions to Christ among the Jews have far outnumbered conversions from other religions to Christianity". Moreover, many of the converts have been of a very high quality. Activities which, under God, have produced a Michael Solomon Alexander (the converted Chief Rabbi of Plymouth who became first Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem), Bishop Schereschewsky (the translator of the Bible into Mandarin Chinese), Neander and Edersheim (the great historians), and theologians of the calibre of the late Dr Levertoff can hardly be described as futile. Here Niebuhr has plainly been misinformed.

So far as the other, more theological arguments are concerned, no reasonable Christian would surely wish to deny that Judaism and Christianity have much in common. The religion of Israel was, after all, the cradle out of which Christianity grew. Yet it is at least arguable that, having missed its fulfilment in Christ, Talmudic Judaism has moved a long way from the religion of the eighth-century prophets. The fundamental point, however, would seem to be "Were the Incarnation and Atonement spiritual luxuries or necessities?" If the true image of God can be found equally well in Judaism without Christ we may well ask with Anselm "Cur Deus Homo?" To suggest that the Jew, unlike all other men, is in no need of the Gospel, is surely to make nonsense of the New Testament. We can gain a fair impression of the sort of rejoinder St Paul would have made to Prof. Niebuhr by reading Romans 9–11.

It may, however, be claimed that the position has altered since New Testament times in view of the long and unhappy history of the relations between Jewry and Christendom. This brings us to the third of Niebuhr's arguments, that "practically nothing can purify the symbol of Christ as the image of God in the imagination of the Jew from the taint with which ages of Christian oppression in the name of Christ tainted it". To this there can surely be only one reply: "*practically* nothing" but not "*absolutely* nothing" can purify the symbol. There remains the one way of selfless, disinterested love, and it is with this love alone that the Christian can approach his Jewish neighbour with any hope of sharing his faith with him. All missionary methods must therefore be submitted to this acid test of love and only such methods as pass this test have any right to survive. In his approach to the Jew the primary aim of the Christian must not be to secure his baptism or even his conversion, but rather to give to him the undistorted image of God in Christ. If that is faithfully given the Holy Spirit can surely be trusted to do the rest.

Yet while the Christian's approach to the Jew must be one of penitence and humility in view of the sins of the past, yet it must also be one of confidence, since the Christian believes that "God hath shined

in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ". If the Christian is true to his faith, whatever the faults of the past, in his present contact with his Jewish neighbour he cannot stop short of offering him, in the words of the late Archbishop William Temple, "a share in the treasures of the Gospel which he has received through no merit of his own".

Yours sincerely,

George H. Stevens,
Editorial Secretary,
Church Mission to Jews.

16 Lincoln's Inn Fields,
London, W.C.2.

BOOK REVIEWS

A New Quest of the Historical Jesus. By James M. Robinson. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 9s. 6d.

Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* was published in English in 1910 under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.* In a sense it may be said to have brought to an end the nineteenth-century "quest" for a Jesus of history stripped of doctrinal interpretation, whose "life" (in the biographical sense) could be written. It is now recognized that the Gospels are "the devotional literature of the primitive Church", rather than sources for scientific history, and that the tradition about Jesus has come down to us "only in so far as it served some function in the life and worship of the primitive Church". The Gospels interpret Jesus in terms of the Church's proclamation concerning him: does this mean that the real "Jesus of history" is lost to us, and that the "quest" has ended only in scepticism?

Dr Robinson does not think so. The idea of a scientifically determined *biography* of Jesus must indeed be given up. But the sources do make possible an *encounter* with Jesus: and that is precisely in line with the conception of history characteristic of the thought of to-day. The contemporary historian no longer attempts to reduce history to an objective science, modelled after the natural sciences; he is interested less in events as such than in their meaning for those who took part in them. Consider, for example, the crucifixion of Jesus. That this was, in the normal sense of the words, an historical occurrence is not to be doubted. But if the Lord's death were to be looked upon as a purely external event, perhaps even as accidental or as involuntary, the Church's proclamation concerning Jesus would be a piece of mythology. The Church's proclamation can be understood as an historical Gospel only if the Lord's death can be seen as his own existential act of accepting his death and of interpreting it as a death to this world. The events and processes of history are in fact individual, unique, inwardly meaningful. They must be interpreted existentially. This means that the historian himself, as he

seeks to apprehend them, is confronted by an encounter and a challenge by which he himself may be radically altered.

The Gospels present us with the Church's *kerygma* or proclamation concerning Jesus. Material in the Gospels which might be held to have *originated* in the Church's preaching may be provisionally placed on one side. But there is other material in the Gospels, material whose "historicity is conceivable in terms of Jesus' Jewish, Palestinian background, and whose origin in the primitive Church is rendered unlikely by the absence of the distinctive views of the Church, or even by the presence of traits which the Church could tolerate, but hardly initiate". There is in fact the possibility of a double encounter with Jesus—an encounter with him through the Church's *kerygma* or preaching, and an encounter with him through sayings and other material preserved in the Gospels and considered likely to be historically authentic. In the opinion of Dr Robinson it has been established that "Jesus intended to confront the hearer with the God who is near when he proclaimed 'Repent, for God's reign is near', i.e. that he intended an eschatological encounter with himself to be an eschatological encounter with God, and that he consequently understood his existence as that of the bringer of eschatological salvation. . . . The historical Jesus confronts us with an existential decision, just as the *kerygma* does."

Dr Robinson deals with a highly technical theme and employs without hesitation a highly technical vocabulary. Presumably he is consciously writing for specialist readers, familiar with the most recent developments of critical scholarship. Even so, he is, I think, needlessly obscure. In the above summary of the book's contents I have tried to put into English what I imagine Dr Robinson to be trying to convey.

A. E. J. Rawlinson, Bp.

London.

Jesus and the Servant. By Morna D. Hooker. S.P.C.K. 27s. 6d.

In this important book Miss Hooker subjects one of the cherished beliefs of many New Testament students (including some distinguished scholars) to a very damaging scrutiny. Her thesis is that, despite all that has been said, there is no incontrovertible evidence for the view that Jesus identified his mission with that of the "Servant"; and that altogether in the New Testament there is no extensive evidence for the use of Isa. 53, still less of the parts of it relating to vicarious suffering. To the question Why is this? her reply is twofold. First, the use of "the Servant" as a title is misleading. She is disposed to deny the detachability of the so-called Servant Songs from the rest of II–Isa., and she sees the Servant as simply Israel viewed in the light of certain aspects of its vocation. On this showing, there is no Servant figure as such: only Israel as duly fulfilling its vocation; and the question of "identifying" the Servant thus ceases to be a real one. Secondly, since the apocalyptic interpretation of Scripture was apparently the dominant one at the time, it is not

surprising that Jesus should have rather chosen the Danielic Son of Man to express his vocation.

In general the present reviewer (who in 1952 himself published a paper containing reference to the rarity of Isa. 53 in the New Testament[1]) finds it impossible to deny Miss Hooker's evidence. So far as details go, she has here and there, perhaps, too lightly dismissed alleged allusions. A good case can still be made for the Acts 3 passage, if not for Acts 4. Also, she nowhere discusses the possibility that Jewish reaction against the later Christian application of Isa. 53 may have obliterated traces of a pre-Christian use of the passage such as might have been favourable to Christian interpretations; nor the possibility that at least a group within Judaism were thinking of their vocation in terms of Israel's "Servant"-role (as the Qumran writings might imply).

But apart from details like these, the only general criticism of her methods that might, perhaps, be justly made is that, following the canon *divide et impera*, she has, by her very careful analytical dismissal of alleged instances of echoes of the "Servant Songs", done less than justice to the cumulative argument. Otherwise, her case, broadly speaking, is soundly argued; and her clear distinction (so seldom properly formulated in works on the subject) between mere suffering and vicarious, redemptive suffering is absolutely right. Dr C. K. Barrett's recent examination of Mark 10 45[2] adds a further buttress to her building.

Miss Hooker has still, however, not really *explained* the paucity of references to Isa. 53. Christians believe that the ministry of Jesus, with his death and resurrection, was in fact redemptive. Isa. 53 is virtually the only Old Testament passage which recognizes undeserved suffering as redemptive for others. Why, then, is there no unequivocal evidence that Jesus applied the relevant passage, and why did the Church do so only very sparingly? Is it possible that the general use of Isa. 53 was precluded by some apologetic circumstance unknown to us? The matter remains obscure.

Be that as it may, on the negative side Miss Hooker's work remains a very able contribution to a discussion which has too often been regarded as closed without due examination. She might have added to her sketch of the Jewish background if she had used E. Lohse's *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*; and, incidentally, Bauer should be added to her bibliography of reference books. Also, she would have enhanced the value of her treatment of Hebrews and 1 Peter by further inquiry into the remarkable use of *ἀναφέρω* ; and on p. 139, Col. 1. 24 surely ought to have been mentioned. But the investigation on the whole is remarkably thorough and penetrating, and every honest student of the New Testament will reckon with it.

C. F. D. Moule.

Cambridge.

---

[1] *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, Bulletin III, 1952, pp. 40 ff.

[2] In *New Testament Essays* (*in mem.* T. W. Manson), ed. A. J. B. Higgins, pp. 1 ff.

A Shorter Commentary on Romans. By Karl Barth. S.C.M. Press. 15s.

The Letter to the Romans. A Commentary. By Emil Brunner. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

St Paul's argument in Romans goes to the very heart of the Christian message, and must be thought through afresh by serious Christians in every generation. The simultaneous appearance of expositions of it by two great German theologians is a happy event which will be appreciated by a wide range of English readers. These are not works for the specialist, but are intended to help the ordinary intelligent reader to discover the meaning of St Paul for himself. They are very similar in style and scope. Both use the method of running paraphrase, avoiding technicalities as far as possible. The argument is not always easy, and demands close attention. Yet, after reading these commentaries straight through, one is left with the impression that here is something of more value to the thoughtful inquirer than many books *about* Christianity. They may well lead him from sympathetic interest to the commitment of faith.

Barth's name is necessarily bound up with Romans, ever since his *Epistle to the Romans* (1918/21) sounded the first note of passionate protest against the liberal theology of the day. The fundamental idea of his interpretation of Romans, and of all the subsequent developments of Barthianism, is that God must be allowed to act and to speak in his own way. Now, in this very concise exposition (184 pages), shorn of all the polemics of theological controversy, the same message comes through with masterly clarity and simplicity. And the keyword is mercy. For the activity of God is pre-eminently gracious.

An advantage for continuous reading—but a danger to proper comprehension—is the fact that Barth does not print the text of the epistle. Brunner's *Letter* scores by including the text of R.S.V. at the head of each short section. Even so, text and exposition together only amount to 130 pages. But for good measure Brunner has added an appendix of fifteen word studies on the chief terms used by St Paul, some of which are specially valuable. It is a straightforward book, likely to be very acceptable to English readers, though it lacks the fire that glows beneath Barth's.

Disagreements between the two writers are rare, in spite of their differences in the field of dogmatic theology. Barth, of course, denies that Rom. 1. 18 ff. can be taken to mean "a genuine knowledge of God" on the part of the Gentiles. Brunner asserts that "the denial of such a 'general revelation' . . . can appeal neither to Paul nor to the Bible at large". But both are agreed that St Paul means that such knowledge as they have is vitiated by the sinful pride of *claiming* to have it. Brunner is fully alive to the danger of such a natural religion. Barth feels he cannot call it the genuine knowledge of God at all. Actually, it was stimulating for the present reviewer to have both books at once, for the one constantly illuminates the comments of the other.

Naturally enough, the figure of Luther stands behind both exposi-

tions. But, just as Barth's appreciation of St Paul's message is wider and deeper and more fundamental than a theological position that can be labelled Barthianism, so it must be recognized that Luther's discovery of the *sola fide* is not the exclusive property of Reformation theology. It is too positive to be confined by the negations of subsequent attempts to systematize it and give it precision. As Louis Bouyer has shown in *The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism,* Luther was reasserting with new force and relevance what was and is an essential proposition of Catholic theology, however much it was obscured by the actual form of late medieval religion. Brunner's statement that "the righteousness of God" is a phrase whose meaning "had lain buried for several hundred years under an alien human tradition of religion" (p. 16) is not really just, and mars a work that is otherwise completely free from sectional prejudice.

The truth is that the meaning of God's justifying mercy in Christ can be apprehended only in the very act of personal religious commitment. Faith is not a virtue, but an active response. You give yourself to the Mercy of God, which is Christ. This alone makes religion real. Moreover, it is when God is revealed as Mercy that he can speak to the heart of man in his predicament to-day the world over, and begin to cross the barriers of the great non-Christian religions. To this end, we cannot have too many aids to the task of coming to grips with Romans. We are accordingly grateful to Barth and Brunner, those great *theologoi,* who open our ears to the Word of God.

Barnabas Lindars, S.S.F.

St Francis House,
Cambridge.

Theological Explanation. By G. F. Woods. Nisbet. 27s. 6d.

The philosophical theologian has his own vocation to "preach the word, dwelling upon it continually, welcome or unwelcome"; and perhaps the most impressive quality of Mr Woods' book is its concentrated pursuit of a single theme. The word upon which he dwells is "explanation". "Scientific explanation" and "historical explanation" are familiar phrases; but "theological explanation is in danger of becoming a polite admission of ignorance". Nevertheless, "those who believe that Christian theology is substantially true cannot permit this phrase to fall out of use. The purpose of this inquiry, therefore, is to study afresh the meaning of 'theological explanation', and to show its legitimacy and importance."

The result is a lucid and methodical discussion which makes few concessions to the dilettante, though an admirable survey of English theology since the eighteenth century and a concluding chapter on Bultmann show the author's mastery of a more popular style of exposition. In the main, Mr Woods develops his thesis in a conscientiously plain and unadorned prose, and with a notable detachment from the common run of contemporary debate. Others may carp at Ryle and Flew; Mr Woods goes his own way, belongs to no school

and owns no allegiance, unless perhaps one may trace an affinity to John Oman and H. H. Farmer.

Yet his thesis is basically familiar. There is a "natural hierarchy" in the methods we employ for understanding the world; scientific and historical explanations leave many questions unanswered, and our quest for an ultimate explanation can be satisfied only by a personal act of self-revelation on the part of an utimate personal being. Three landmarks may be noted. First, "explanation" has four senses at least; it may mean the act of making plain; or the state of being plain (or, seeing plainly?); or the statement of what is made plain; or, finally, the thing itself which is made plain in the completed explanation. Secondly, our understanding of our own being, however limited, resists all attempts at merely impersonal explanation. We learn to understand each other by extrapolating from our own experience; but the greatest measure of understanding is afforded by personal self-disclosure. Thirdly, the author's conception of theological explanation comes to light in a revealing passage on pp. 150–1. It is "understood as an enterprise in which both God and man are engaged. Our quest for an explanation of ultimate being which concluded that the ultimate was personal represented the tradition of Natural Theology. The effort of personal ultimate being to make itself plain to us represents the tradition of Revealed Theology."

Two comments may be briefly outlined. First, I feel that Mr Woods dwells too much on the mere etymology of the word "explanation". It can surely be only a lucky accident if this is any more revealing than the effort to elucidate scientific hypothesis by explaining how foundations are "put down" for building on, or to discuss "discussion" by explaining the mechanics of sifting. Further, I think it leads Mr Woods to camouflage his real objective. His opening chapters dispose us to conceive theological explanation as a sort of Leibnizian theodicy, in which we shall finally confront the massive and simple, yet plain and distinct, ideas which constitute the divine mind. Of course nothing so naive is intended; it becomes abundantly clear that God's self-disclosure is never completed *ad nos* in this world: the mystery remains, along with a well-founded confidence that our questions are progressively answered in proportion to our own spiritual development, and as we learn to know him through his incarnate Word. This argument may well promote greater confidence in theology and a better understanding of its aims and methods; I cannot think that it will ever rehabilitate the phrase, "theological explanation".

G. C. Stead.

Keble College,
Oxford.

Les livres secrètes des gnostiques d'Egypte: Introduction aux écrits gnostiques coptes découverts à Khenoboskion. By Jean Doresse. (*Illustrated.*) Librairie Plon. Paris.

The recovery of a large number of Gnostic manuscripts from the

sands of Egypt, which occurred about the same time as the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls, naturally attracted nothing like so much publicity. Not that the documents are necessarily of less historical importance—they may even prove to be of more—to students of Christian origins. But the Egyptian writings were already dispersed through the clandestine market when scholars got on the track of them; and their acquisition, identification and publication were held up by difficulties, not yet all overcome, and complicated by the coincident political changes in Egypt. The book under review gives a full account of the discovery by a fine Coptic expert of France, who was the first to be allowed to inspect and catalogue all that had come to light.

These codices of papyrus are an immense acquisition for the learned world. Previously there were no original copies of Gnostic scriptures beyond the *Pistis-Sophia* in the British Museum, the Bruce Codex at Oxford, the Berlin Codex which disappeared in the last great war, and a few small fragments. Now we have, from the earthen pot dug up at Chenoboskion, what may well be almost the whole library of an Egyptian Gnostic group—no less than forty-four books, buried probably during a "drive" against Gnostic literature about the beginning of the fifth century. The books were written in the third and fourth centuries and are translations of works in Greek, some or most of them known to Christian heresiologists as early as, e.g., St Irenaeus. It is to anti-Gnostic writings, Christian and pagan, that we have owed hitherto practically all we could discover about the beliefs and practices of the Gnostics. How much more are we likely to learn now that we have a sizeable sample of their secret literature?

To that question M. Doresse's admirable survey of the contents of the codices provides a provisional and cautious answer. His treatise is enriched by references to all the outstanding evidences from early Christian and classical authors, to archaeology, and to the efforts of scholars (nearly all French and German) to reconstruct the history of this obscure but once powerful movement. In fact, M. Doresse has put us in his debt for what is not only the first general account of a fascinating find, but must surely be the best descriptive outline of the phenomenon of Gnosticism yet produced.

What the early Christian Fathers—and Plotinus—reported of Gnostic literature gains credit, on the whole, now that we have a number of the books they criticized and can verify their quotations. The new documentation is already throwing light on the character, liturgy and history of these sects, and will illuminate them more and more as study proceeds. One of the wonders of Gnosticism (powerfully evoked by M. Doresse's survey, though he also helps towards explanation of it) is that while its many schools never produced a Church, it flourished so long and identifiably as a movement. Sporadic in origin, excessively eclectic in doctrines, narrowly sectarian and fissiparous in organization, nevertheless its scattered groups of devotees read and handed on the same sacred books for many generations.

The new writings should considerably deepen our understanding of the impact of Christianity before its official recognition, reflecting as they do the tropical jungle of theogonies and cosmogonies which the Gospel had to clear in order to produce a civilized and civilizing religious landscape. Of this aspect of the matter—and the Gnostics' "fatal fascination" by the rising religion which they could not accept —M. Doresse's comprehensive approach gives us a most interesting view. The Christian elements in Gnosticism are well represented in the Chenoboskion codices; the outstanding item of this kind is the *Gospel of Thomas*, a work which was immediately identified as the collection of "sayings of Jesus" of which we had previously nothing but a few tatters of papyrus. Of this great acquisition Dr Cullman has already produced a theological study. A translation of this *Thomas* is to be included in the amplified English of the present work, which is announced by Hollis and Carter.

M. Doresse's highly elaborate book—easily readable, however, for all its hundreds of footnotes—shows that the Egyptian discovery is bringing us nearer to a more adequate grasp of what Gnosticism really was; although, as he also shows, the little we already possessed of its writings is representative of its best spirit—notably so the *Pistis-Sophia*. Sometimes, in the new writings as in those we had before, the turgid stream of discourse about aeons and archons, protennoia and so forth clears a little and we find prayers or hymns of arresting sincerity and beauty, sometimes even spiritual theories that have not lost their charm and remind one of quite recent theosophical speculations. Will some of the obscurer writings prove interpretable by the kind of psychological method tentatively proposed for the *Pistis-Sophia* by Fr Victor White in his *God and the Unconscious*? That question may well be of more than academic interest and importance in this age of depth-psychology. But before the religious court of appeal, the writings that have served their 1,500 years incarceration underground can only be released to the lighter imprisonment of the libraries. For it can only pass the same sentence as M. Doresse pronounces in his final words:

> First to read the Gnostic writings and then to take up the New Testament is an experience worth having: we soon feel, upon re-reading the greatest books of authentic Christianity, treasures of life even more abundant than we had yet discerned. We realize the incomparable superiority of these texts accessible to all in their imagery and meaning. We are astonished that the Gnosticisms were so long able to compete with them, and can understand why the sectaries, faced with that religion, preferred to keep their own dogmas secret and themselves in the dark.

PHILIP MAIRET.

LEWES.

SHORTER NOTICES

Open Communion in the Church of England. By J. Mark M. Dalby. Church Book Room Press. 1959. 4s. 6d.

This book—a remarkable achievement by an Anglican ordinand—is a clear and valuable presentation, on historical and theological grounds, of the case for open communion in the Church of England.

On the premises from which it is written Mr Dalby's argument is unanswerable, and seems to me final, for instance, against those who would use the Confirmation rubric as a fence against Nonconformists. His case, however, is weakened by the fact that he does not appear to have come fully to grips with the much more corporate theology of the Body of Christ and its implications for intercommunion which marks recent biblical and ecumenical discussion. I believe that this theology in fact supports the thesis he is arguing, that it is "*because* of the one loaf that we who are many are one body". But his argument would have carried more weight if it had been backed by the statements of some of the current leaders in ecumenical theology rather than by those of ageing evangelicals who, rightly or wrongly, are not felt to have come to terms with the high doctrine of the Church now characteristic of the best ecumenical thinking, catholic and reformed alike.

The same inadequate theology of the Church betrays itself in the fact that the question is posed entirely in the form of how *individuals* may act or be received in this matter. This, of course, continues to remain an important issue. But the more creative question in the emerging situation would seem to be how local Christian communities may proceed who have reached the point of co-operation at which separate tables, at any rate on certain occasions, become more of a scandal than one. In this situation, I believe, advance is more likely to come, not by mutual open communion (which is bound to divide the consciences of most Anglican congregations, even if it were to be sanctioned), but (as I have suggested elsewhere in this number) by some form of concelebration—breaking the one loaf through our divided ministries *together*. This possibility is not discussed, any more than it was in the World Council of Churches' volume on *Intercommunion*.

But Mr Dalby has done a most useful task in assembling the undoubted Anglican tradition on the practice of open communion, even though, as he freely admits, he is usually dependent on secondary sources. His book carries forewords by the Bishop of Leicester and Dr Hugh Martin, and is agreeably produced at a modest price.

John Woolwich.

Tertullian: Treatises on Penance. Translated and annotated by William P. Le Saint. Volume 28 in the series Ancient Christian Writers. Longmans. 30s.

The volume under review is worthy of purchase on its own merits,

independently of those of the series in which it appears. The purpose of the series is to make a patristic text—in this case Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* and *De Pudicitia*—available to the general English reader, by means of a good translation with notes supplying the information needed to make it intelligible. This purpose Dr Le Saint fulfils admirably. He is a scholar of mature learning who has thrown himself into the study of Tertullian. He has been at great pains to ensure that his renderings are linguistically justified, and, where readings are doubtful, to justify his choice of the word to be translated. He handles controversial questions in a remarkably fair and untendencious manner (e.g. the question whether private penance existed in the early Church) providing the reader with an objective statement of relevant facts and arguments. And there is much in the volume that will repay the attention of scholars. The general reader may appreciate particularly, in this volume, the printing of the page number of the translation at the head of the corresponding page of notes. Thus, when he wants help, he can quickly find it, without the need to keep turning to the notes.

It may surprise many that this should be the first full commentary on the *De Pudicitia* to be published, and that the text of that work rests for the most part on MSS no longer extant. Finally, the printing of the two works on Penance for consecutive reading, one by Tertullian as Catholic and the other by Tertullian as Montanist, provides an interest like that of Browning's "Half Rome" and "The Other Half Rome" in *The Ring and the Book*. And Dr Le Saint does not withhold admiration from the fanatical second work of the two.

W. Telfer.

Faversham.

Creighton on Luther. An Inaugural Lecture. By Owen Chadwick. Cambridge University Press. 1959. 3s. 6d. net.

No one acquainted with the new Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History would expect from him anything short of a brilliant Inaugural Lecture, and this fully comes up to expectations. Wisely Dr Chadwick has chosen for his topic a specific historiographical problem rather than a more general subject, and this gives his lecture a unity and bite not easily obtainable on such an occasion. The problem is that of his great predecessor, Creighton's, apparently inadequate picture of Luther in his *History of the Papacy*, amusingly described as "Luther seen by a humane and tolerant Monsignor through a window in the Vatican". It is examined in the light of Creighton's personality, beliefs and psychology, the conclusion being that the root cause of the great bishop's coolness towards Luther lies in the facts that he was an historian first and a theologian second, had an acute appreciation of statesmanship and was profoundly conscious of the close bond between political and religious society. Luther was ultimately world-renouncing, Creighton world-

affirming. The verdict seems sound and is worked out with the mixture of exact scholarship and subtle humour characteristic of the lecturer. One is left, however, with a final question. Was Creighton so wrong after all? Luther's stature cannot be denied, nor his profound influence upon all subsequent history. But if one asks whether he succeeded according to his own standards the answer is more doubtful. Creighton himself has stated the problem in lapidary phrases. Luther "could no longer claim to command the movement which he had originated. His ideas were clearly capable of other meanings than he was willing to allow. They had been cast upon the world, and the world would deal with them in its own way. There was henceforth a difference between the Lutheran movement and Luther. The simplicity of an ideal had passed away, and the sternness of practical life had been disclosed." Therein lies a fact upon which the whole later history of Lutheranism is a commentary. Luther's was no doubt a seminal mind. But has anyone yet reaped a consistent harvest from it?

Thomas M. Parker.

University College,
Oxford.

A Theology of Grace. By Jean Daujat. Burns and Oates. 1959. 7s. 6d.

The Concept of Grace. By Philip S. Watson. Epworth Press. 1959. 10s. 6d.

Jesus the World's Perfecter. By Karl Heim. Oliver and Boyd. 1959. 21s.

Here are three books on Grace.

The first is Roman Catholic, translated from the French by a Benedictine nun of Glenbrook Abbey, and published as a Faith and Fact book. Jean Daujat writes almost too lucidly. He seems to know all about the subject or, at any rate, to belong to a Church which knows all about it. He tries to be accurate, and tells us that "gratia plena" translates a single Greek word which means that Mary is "the object of the plenitude of divine love". He quotes Scripture and Fathers and papal encyclicals, and defines many heresies, such as that of Luther and Calvin, that Grace is a mere pardon, saving from punishment, but not transforming or changing "interiorly". At the end we have four pages on "Non-sacramental grace in the case of non-catholics". All very good in its way. But, somehow, I found it neither gripping nor convincing. Perhaps I was wrong in being put off by the following sentences, "Since grace is something far beyond man's natural capacities, we can explain *precisely* what the supernatural life of grace is only after we have considered his natural potentialities . . . we shall then explain *exactly* what is meant by supernatural life . . ." (italics mine). When people speak like that, let us remember, and remind those who are impressed by it, that the

bishop, you the priest, I, you, she or anyone else can talk like that if we want to, with as much, or more, or less authority.

Philip S. Watson, of Wesley House, Cambridge, provides a very modest, sound, careful and sober series of essays, written from the point of view of a scholarly Methodist whose chief teachers are Wesley and Luther. He deals with St Paul, Baptism, Justification, the Holy Spirit, Dogma as an affirmation of grace, the developments of the doctrine of grace, and the reality of grace as seen in creation, in Christ, and in the Church. His theology is biblical, churchly, and sacramental, and he writes well and clearly.

But there is something lacking about both these books in comparison with the third. Each expresses views sincerely held, and has been carefully written and well put together. But they lack the inevitability and the drive of the third. I took it up first, and could not stop reading till I had finished it. Having read it, I found myself at first unable and unwilling to read the other two.

Karl Heim, professor at Tübingen University, writes on the Atonement and Renewal of the world, and has been translated by D. H. van Daalen into English we found easy to read. The second German edition was pubished in 1939. In the 1952 Preface the author says that his book "does not offer any new historical or theological discoveries which would be unknown to a serious reader of the Bible. But in the time of suffering and judgment through which our nation is now passing it has rendered a certain service, especially to those people who are at their wit's end about their own destiny and can no longer understand the destiny of this nation . . . the question of guilt must be solved first . . . not until much later can the question of power find its divine solution . . . in prisoner of war camps . . . this book has often been passed from hand to hand." All the resources of "infallible" Churches, and of academic scholarship, and ministerial experience, grow rather pale. Here is one who has been up against it, who has lived in a country where Satan seemed in control, and has cried "How long, O Lord, how long?" To drink of that cup and to be baptized with that baptism qualifies a witness who happens to be a profound scholar.

We follow a track along a ridge with antinomies like abysses yawning on either side, or along a glen bottom with paradoxes rising like cliffs to right and left. Illustrations come from ancient Germanic religion, from India, and even from an Irish rebel called Roger Casement. But Scripture is the chief source. The method is expository rather than apologetic, the author describes an experience.

Shades of Origen's hook and Augustine's mousetrap, and the ransom paid to the devil! Anselm and Abelard are both coolly dismissed as an attempt on the part of man to act as his own creditor. A theory is worked out of the Atonement, not as a transaction with, but as a genuine victory over, Satan. We see Guilt as Man's chief problem, and Reconciliation as his chief need. Satan has a claim on every one of us, and can accuse us. Only Christ the sinless One has faced that on the Cross in total lack of power. God showed his power in Christ's Resurrection. Then he withholds the display of his power

till the end. So now we have the period of testing and of the gathering of the Church, while Satanic hatred of God makes martyrs of the few faithful witnesses. This is not a Creed for sunny weather, but a Faith to make you face storms and eruptions and the worse things man or the devil can now do.

But you must read for yourself. It is a book as impossible to describe or summarize as a poem or a piece of music or a picture or a landscape or a good speech or sermon. Those who have reached Kierkegaard's "diacritical point", where roads fork to heaven or hell, will probably get all into focus, start from where Karl Heim starts, and read with avidity. Others (who will not necessarily be morally inferior) will be unable to make head or tail of it. My persuasion of its excellence may merely be a personal point of view, but still, I have a right to express it, which I have here exercised.

Cosslett Quin.

St John's,
Cork.

The Country Priest in English History. By A. Tindal Hart. Phoenix House. 25s.

This is the best of the four good historical books which Dr Hart has written about the country parson. It represents the author's mature reflections on a subject to which he has already devoted many years of scholarly research. I think the general reader, as well as the student, will find it the most entertaining of the four.

Dr Hart assesses the place of the parson in rural society through the ages under the heads of religious leader, scholar, educationalist, sportsman and odd man out. The last reminded me of the Bishop of Southwell's recent complaint about the tragic disappearance of the eccentric in our over-regimented society. There follow two valuable chapters on the evolution of the parsonage and the economic background. In the latter Dr Hart makes the interesting point that the occasional outbreaks of anticlericalism in this country have usually had an economic origin. The evidence he produces both in this book and in the others convinces me that the average country parson to-day has no greater measure of discouragement to contend with in his work than the majority of his predecessors had in other centuries; but I suspect, after reading the last chapter ("The Present Position: 1958"), that the author is of the opinion that the church has lost more in the rural areas than it has gained in the last hundred years. If so, I do not altogether agree with him.

The author is himself a country rector and rural dean; and is descended from a long line of country parsons. He writes from inside his subject with affection and understanding. His illustrations are well chosen, especially one of his own grandfather with daughter, parlourmaid, pony and pets assembled outside a typical vicarage porch. By contrast, a contemporary cartoon exactly illustrates a quotation from an article by the present Bishop of Grimsby describing the changing relationship between incumbent and diocese. Of

the few criticisms I have to make of this book, one is that in the chapter on the parson's recreations so much space has been given to his exploits on the hunting-field and so little to the organized sports which in the nineteenth century filtered through from the playing-fields of the public school to the village green—I suspect very largely by way of muscular Christians in Holy Orders.

Dr Hart has addressed himself with skill and artistry to a wide canvas. When he returns to research in a more limited field again, I hope he will not forget that he has missed the fruitful period between 1660 and 1702 and that we can, therefore, look forward to yet another book on the same subject from his pen.

F. H. West.

Ranskill,
Nottinghamshire.

Studies in Eucharistic Faith and Practice. Edited by F. L. Cross. Mowbray.

3. The Orthodox Liturgy. By Austin Oakley. 4s. 6d.

4. The Gallican Liturgy. By W. S. Porter. 6s.

Mr Oakley belongs to that company of embassy and "factory" chaplains abroad who have used their time in observation and returned to instruct their fellow-countrymen. This little book contains an explanation of the furniture and actions of the Byzantine Liturgy as the author knew them at the Phanar. It is an elementary guide, and a good one. But those who would find it most useful will be hindered by the use of untranslated Greek and unexplained technical terms.

Concerning the second of these *Studies* there are no reservations. W. S. Porter was a parish priest of rare learning, but was practically unknown in this country. The excellence of his reputation in Spain may be gathered from the fact that his articles on Spanish monasticism in *Laudate* were "discovered" by Spanish scholars after his death and translated into Spanish. *The Gallican Rite* is the work of a master. A difficult subject is made plain. The evidence is set out without the fairy stories with which men have commonly supplanted it. So that what has been the most difficult part of Western liturgy to introduce to the student is now the easiest. He can be told: "Read Porter; and then get to work on the texts."

Bernard Wigan.

Mark Beech.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Allen and Unwin: Harold Loukes, *The Castle and the Field* (6s. and 4s. 6d.); H. D. Lewis, *Our Experience of God* (30s.); G. D. Yarnold, *The Spiritual Crisis of the Scientific Age* (18s.); K. Ullmann, *Between God and History* (21s.).

Burns and Oates: Léon Cristiani, *Why We Believe* (7s. 6d.); Joseph Lécuyer, *What is a Priest?* (7s. 6d.); Léon Cristiani, *Heresies and Heretics* (7s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: C. F. D. Moule, *An Idion-Book of New Testament Greek* [2nd edition. See THEOLOGY, March 1955, pp. 105 ff.] (30s. and 18s. 6d.).

CHALLONER PUBLICATIONS: Dom E. Flicoteaux, *Our Lady in the Liturgy* (7s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Michael Day, *The Communication of Conviction* (2s. 6d.); Jean Guitton, *The Modernity of St Augustine* (7s. 6d.); Réné Voillaume, *Abodes of God: The Church, Our Lady* (3s. 6d.).

CHURCH INFORMATION OFFICE: *The Task of the Church in Relation to Industry* (1s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: James Denny, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation* [a photographic reprint of a standard work] (17s. 6d.).

COLLINS: William Barclay, *Eductional Ideals in the Ancient World* (21s.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL: Daniel Pezeril, *Pauvre et Saint Curé d'Ars* (n.p.); Jean Meyendorff, *St Grégorie Palamas et la mystique orthodoxe* (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: H. H. Rowley, *The Changing Pattern of Old Testament Studies* (2s. 6d.); William Strawson, *Jesus and the Future Life* (30s.).

FAITH PRESS: Michael Bruce (Ed.), *Barriers to Unity* (15s.); Fr Hugh, S.S.F., *No Escape from Love* (6s.).

HARPERS: Norman K. Gottwald, *A Light to the Nations* ($6.50).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: H. E. Hopkins, *The Mystery of Suffering* (3s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Henry van Etten, *George Fox and the Quakers* (6s.); S. G. A. Luff, *Silent Bedes* (8s. 6d.); D. S. Bailey, *The Man-Woman Relation in Christian Thought* (30s.); Hilda Graef, *The Light and the Rainbow* (35s.); A. H. Purcell Fox, *The Church's Ministry of Healing* (10s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: D. T. Niles, *The Preacher's Calling to be Servant* (12s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: Walther von Loewenich, *Modern Catholicism* (50s.).

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS: A. J. B. Higgins (Ed.), *New Testament Essays* (42s.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: M. C. Warburton, *The Unceasing Conflict* (6s.); A. C. Osborn Hann, *Ronnie and the Collects* (5s.); A. J. Watts, *Seeing Things* (25s.).

NISBET: T. H. Croxall, *Glimpses and Impressions of Kierkegaard* (15s.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: Gustaf Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation* (21s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Paul Tillich, *Theology of Culture* (18s.).

RADWINTER RECTORY (SAFFRON WALDEN): C. G. Brigley, *The Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin, Radwinter* [new edition] (2s.).

RANKIN (BRISTOL): George Melhuish, *The Paradoxical Universe* (21s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Charles Davey, *Lament for Victory* (15s.); E. H. Robertson, *The New Translations of the Bible* (10s. 6d.); G. A. F. Knight, *A Christian Theology of the Old Testament* (30s.).

SKEFFINGTON: Robert Davidson, *The Bible Speaks* (16s.).

S.P.C.K.: *Baptism and Confirmation* (7s. 6d.); S. C. Carpenter, *Church and People, 1789–1889* [Seraph Book reprint in 3 parts. For review by J. W. C. Wand, see THEOLOGY, December 1933, pp. 334 ff.] (5s. each); D. E. W. Harrison, *The Book of Common Prayer* [The Dean of Bristol's book, first published in 1946, reissued as a Seraph Book; it was reviewed by A. H. Couratin in THEOLOGY, August 1946, pp. 246 ff.] (4s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

FACTS AND FIGURES
about the
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
1959

Containing important truths about the human and material extent of the life and work of the Church.

4/6d., postage 9d.

From S.P.C.K. and other booksellers or direct from the publishers

---

CHURCH INFORMATION OFFICE
Church House, Westminster, S.W.1.

CHARLES SIMEON
1759-1836

21s. net.

This collection of essays, edited by M. Pollard and H. Hennell, have been prepared to commemorate the centenary of Simeon's birth, 24 September 1759.

S · P · C · K

MOWBRAYS' LIST

CHRISTENDOM. A Survey of all the Christian Churches throughout the world, their Doctrines, Constitutional Forms, and Ways of Worship. By Einar Molland, Dr.Theol.(Oslo), Hon.D.D.(Durham), Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oslo. 35*s*.

This important book will meet a real need. It is a surprising fact that no reliable and comprehensive source-book of information about all the different Christian Churches and Denominations at present exists in the English language, in spite of discussion on the subject of Reunion. All branches of the Christian Faith are fully covered, in matters of belief and worship, constitutional systems, and statistical data: every Communion is represented, the Orthodox, the Roman Catholic, and the Anglican; the worldwide Protestant Churches, Lutheran, Methodist, Congregationalist, and Baptist; and not only does the book include offshoots like the Old Catholics, the Plymouth Brethren, the Moravians, the Adventists, but religious systems containing elements derived from Christianity, like Unitarianism, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Mormonism. This is not only a book for libraries, but for clergy and lay people generally interested in the wider implications of Christianity.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND MODERN THOUGHT An Enquiry into the Historical, Theological, and Psychological Aspects of the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. By Lindsay Dewar, M.A., B.D., Rector of Much Hadham, Herts, and Canon of St. Albans. 25*s*.

In this comprehensive study the author, who is well known as an authority and writer on moral theology, brings home the centrality of this Doctrine in Biblical and Patristic theology. Beginning with the Old Testament teaching on the Spirit of God, he shows the gradual unfolding of the Doctrine through the experiences and meditations of the New Testament writers and the Fathers. In a concluding section on " The Psychological Interpretation " he makes a significant and original contribution to the understanding of the healing ministry by showing how the Holy Spirit, working on the natural level, assists the psychiatrist and his patient, and what the operation of the Unconscious, Clairvoyance, and Telepathy owe to the Spirit.

THE MIRROR OF FAITH. By William of St. Thierry. Translated and edited by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. 6*s*.

Authorities like Etienne Gilson and Louis Bouyer have implied that William of St. Thierry is the greatest of the Cistercians in thought, depth, and originality. This translation into English of his *Speculum Fidei* is a theological treatise of the first rank in Cistercian literature. 6*s*.

HEADINGS FOR THE LESSONS By Henry de Candole, Bishop of Knaresborough. In one volume. 6*s*.

Covering Years I and II of the New Lectionary with the latest revisions by Convocation.

A BOOK OF PRAYERS FOR COMMUNICANTS With Instruction on Christian Duties. By W. J. G. Bartlet and W. H. H. Elliott. New Edition now printed (10th impression). Cloth boards. 3*s*.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD, 28 Margaret St, London, W.1

35 Pembroke Street, Oxford – 14 King's Parade, Cambridge

And at Leeds, Birmingham, and Manchester